DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 008 HE 024 828

AUTHOR	Teichler, Ulrich
TITLE	Recognition: A Typological Overview of Recognition Issues Arising in Temporary Study Abroad. Erasmus Monographs No. 3. Werkstattberichte 29.
INSTITUTION	ERASMUS Bureau, Brussels (Belgium).; Kassel Univ. (West Germany). Scientific Center for Professional and University Research.
SPONS AGENCY	Commission of the European Communities, Brussels (Belgium).
REPORT NO	ISBN-3-88122-618-4
PUB DATE	90
NOTE	67p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Credits; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *International Educational Exchange; *Recognition (Achievement); Student Exchange Programs; Study Abroad; *Transfer Policy
IDENTIFIERS	*ERASMUS Bureau (Belgium); *Europe; European Community

ABSTRACT

This examined uses of the term "recognition" in relation to student mobility within organized higher educational exchange, particularly within the ERASMUS (European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students) program in Europe. Using typological and exemplary approaches, the study drew on select reports and other documentation provided by coordinators of Inter-University Cocperation Programmes supported by ERASMUS in addition to meetings conducted with participating students and programme directors as well as from surveys conducted on programs. The examination of these sources revealed that recognition had four meanings in use, three of which were used in the context of study abroad programs. Also, recognition of a period of study is generally considered to be very important. The study also identified six obstacles to recognition, and particularly to full recognition of study abroad. However, despite these obstacles, the study identified seven strategies that institutions use to grant full or partial recognition. Coordinators within the ERASMUS program reported specific recognition problems. Finally the study outlined the recognition provisions, curricular arrangements, assessment and recognition strategies and practical implications within the ERASMUS program. The text includes 11 references and an abbreviated version of the text in German. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ulrich Teichler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- [x] This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- [ ] Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Ulrich Teichler

RECOGNITION

A Typological Overview of Recognition Issues Arising in Temporary Study Abroad

HE 024 828

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2

ERASMUS Monographs No. 3

Ulrich Teichler

RECOGNITION

A Typological Overview of Recognition Issues Arising in Temporary Study Abroad

WERKSTATTBERICHTE - Band 29

Wissenschaftliches Zentrum
für Berufs- und Hochschulforschung
der Gesamthochschule Kassel

Kassel 1990

ERASMUS Monographs No. 3

This study was commissioned by the ERASMUS Bureau, Brussels, on behalf of the Task Force Human Resources, Education, Training and Youth of the Commission of the European Communities.

The present report has been prepared in the context of the monitoring and evaluation of the European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students (ERASMUS). It is designed primarily for use within the services of the Commission of the European Communities, and although the report is being placed at the disposal of the general public, it is emphasized that the views which it contains are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position of the Comission or of the ERASMUS Bureau, which assists the Commission in the management of ERASMUS.

Copyright (c) 1988 ERASMUS Bureau
rue d'Arlon 15
B-1040 Bruxelles

WERKSTATTBERICHTE
Herausgeber: Wissenschaftliches Zentrum für
Berufs- und Hochschulforschung
der Gesamthochschule Kassel - Universität,
Henschelstraße 4, D-3500 Kassel
Redaktion: Christiane Rittgerott
Druck: Druckwerkstatt Bräuning, Vellmar
ISBN: 3-88122-618-4
Gesamthochschulbibliothek

Foreword

The award of full academic recognition is one of the main criteria for awarding ERASMUS grants to Inter-university Cooperation Programmes (ICP) and to students within these ICPs as well as to "free movers" studying in other European Community countries with the help of ERASMUS outside the framework of ICPs. Indeed, the emphasis on recognition is one of the main characteristics and experiments of the ERASMUS Programme itself. As such, the concept and definition of "recognition" is rightly the object of the closest attention. It is therefore only natural that one of the evaluation studies in the first phase of ERASMUS (1987-89) should concentrate on this important area.

Full academic recognition differs from the other criteria to be met in order to obtain support from the ERASMUS Programme by being a matter of substance as distinct from administration, in that it is not just a question of formality, but touches on the very roots of every single university's right to determine the contents of its degree courses.

Introducing the European Communities Course Credit Transfer System (ECTS) in 1989 marked a new path to be explored, a path which might never have appeared but for the many and varied kinds of recognition introduced by ICP's form the very start of ERASMUS. Academic recognition experiments are still being carried out in many ICPs, and it is my hope that the publication of this study will further stimulate the debate, the experiments and the ongoing task of securing recognition of academic activities carried out by students going abroad.

The present study is based on a thorough investigation of the multitude of forms of recognition presented in the ICPs of the first year of ERASMUS, and shows not only the obstacles, the problems and the types of arrangements adopted with regard to academic recognition, but also offers recommendations for future practices, though caution is advocated with regard to giving fixed recipes; ICPs should continue to be a smelting pot where new alloys are being tested, and I hope that this publication will assist institutions in however modest a way to reflect upon and thereby further enhance this process of innovation in an area of central importance to ERASMUS.

Ulrich Teichler

Contents

1.	Introduction	7
2.	The Various Meanings of the Term "Recognition"	8
3.	Three Types of Recognition	12
4.	The Importance of Recognition	14
5.	Obstacles to Recognition	16
6.	Extent of Recognition	21
7.	Major Institutional Strategies Regarding Recognition	24
8.	Recognition Problems of ERASMUS-Supported Programmes According to the Reports of Coordinators	29
9.	Educational and Administrative Provisions of the Programme as the Basis of Recognition Arrangements	31
10.	Curricular Arrangements Relevant to Recognition	36
11.	Assessment and Recognition Procedures	41
12.	Some Practical Implications	45
References		51
Anerkennung und Anrechung des Auslandsstudiums in Europa - Erfahrungen und Probleme (Kurzfassung des englischen Textes)		53

1. Introduction

This study aims to provide an overview of

- various uses of the term "recognition" in relation to student mobility within organised exchange,
- typical modes of recognition of periods of study abroad in ERASMUS-supported student mobility, and
- typical problems in recognition of periods of study abroad and typical forms of partial recognition.

The study, written in Summer 1989, takes into account select reports and other documentation provided by coordinators of Inter-University Cooperation Programmes supported by the ERASMUS scheme in 1987/88. It should, however, be noted that these reports are only partly relevant to the issues discussed here. First, they address a variety of themes on a limited number of pages and thus normally make only a brief reference to recognition. Furthermore the full range of provisions for, and problems of, recognition are not likely to be prominent in official reports to a support scheme like ERASMUS, because recognition is a precondition for being granted support and it is likely to be felt that honest reporting on recognition might be penalized by a discontinuation of support. Again, the reports written by participating students are short and written immediately upon return, and, as a rule, do not address issues of recognition.

We are in the fortunate situation, however, that this report can draw in addition upon evidence from meetings conducted with participating students and programme directors as well as from surveys conducted on programmes supported in the framework of Joint Study Programmes, the EC support scheme preceding ERASMUS, and on other study abroad programmes (Dalichow and Teichler, 1986; Baron and Smith, 1987; Teichler, Smith and Steube, 1988; Teichler and Opper, 1988). This has enabled us to present the typical issues in some detail, even if not with the range of data which an in-depth study of ERASMUS-supported programmes would have revealed.

It is hoped that the typological and exemplary approach adopted here may furnish the basis for further studies which eventually indicate the extent to which certain solutions are selected and problems are identified.

2. The Various Meanings of the Term "Recognition"

When we meet the term "recognition" in the context of student mobility between different countries (in the framework of this study between Member States of the European Community), we note various meanings which are often not clearly distinguished. Therefore any attempt to report on experiences acquired regarding recognition in the initial stage of the ERASMUS programme has to start by clarifying definitions and the scope of the analysis. We can discern four uses of the term "recognition":

- "recognition" as a principle: the readiness to accept or 'give recognition to' study abroad;
- "recognition" as a set of mechanisms: regulations and processes for implementing such acceptance;
- "recognition" as approval of course programmes (degree programmes) with a component of study abroad
- "recognition" as certification of study abroad.

The four uses of the term may be explained briefly as follows:

(1) Recognition as a principle: the readiness to accept study abroad

"Recognition" in this context means that units (a certain period or a certain number of courses) of study at another institution of higher education in another country, where a student studies only temporarily (i.e. not for a complete course programme), are considered to correspond to specified units of study at the institution of higher education at which the student aims to complete the course programme in the home country.

This is for example the principal meaning of "recognition" referred to in the ERASMUS programme: the regulation that mobility grants to students will only be provided if study in another EC country is recognized by the home institution. In the most typical case, the student might leave an institution of higher education in his or her home country for a limited period and spend that period at an institution of higher education in another EC country, where the home institution has established regular cooperation with the host institution in order to set up the educational arrangements and, possibly, the assessment and administrative arrangements most likely to ensure that the country of the home institution will consider his or her study at the host institution as corresponding to study at home.

In the framework of this first definition of "recognition" we do not have to establish what is meant by the "unit" to be recognized (a period of study, cer-

tain numbers of courses, certain distinct courses etc.), what units abroad are considered equivalent to study at home, how the recognition is assured (for example loosely stated intentions by the academic staff or written guarantee, general acceptance or detailed written undertakings, and recognition for more or less all students except a few unsuccessful cases, or only for those students who meet very demanding success criteria). This first definition simply refers to the principle of institutions of higher education considering a period of study in another country as corresponding to study at their own institution, without regard to how recognition is actually implemented, over a range from informal acceptance to minute regulations regarding equivalence.

(2) Recognition as a set of mechanisms: regulations and processes of translation and transfer

The second use of the term "recognition" refers also to issues of acceptance of units of studies taken at an institution of higher education in another country by the institution of higher education concerned; in contrast to the first definition, which addresses the principle or the likelihood of considering study abroad as corresponding to study at home, the second definition refers to the mechanisms whereby study at another institution is accepted as equivalent or alternative to study at the home institution, as well as the results of their application. "Recognition" in this context refers to regulations and procedures for recognition, such as methods of assessment, documentation and possibly harmonization of examining and, ultimately, certification officially stating that successful study at another institution in another country corresponds to study at home.

Within this definition we might refer, for example, to lists of courses abroad considered in principle to correspond to courses at home, examinations abroad jointly assessed by teachers of the home and host institutions, regulations for translating grades awarded abroad into grades at home, or regulations permitting statements by the partner institution about success in study units or periods abroad to be automatically accepted by the home institution. "Recognition" in this sense refers to the matching of studies at different institutions, whereby a certain degree of formalization of "recognition" is established which is more than merely a general mutual confidence in academic quality or simply a readiness in general terms to respect studies undertaken at another institution. One has to bear the difference between the first and second definition in mind in order not to imply that "recognition", in terms of considering studies at different institutions to correspond to each other, automatically means a detailed and formalized spelling out of corresponding elements and of extended formalized procedures of harmonization.

In German, we might call the first definition (i.e. the principle of acceptance) "Anerkennung" and the second definition (i.e. the formalities for establishing correspondence) "Anrechnung".

(3) "Recognition" as approval of course programmes with a component of study abroad

Whereas the two uses of the term "recognition" discussed up to now refer to decisions on partial studies affecting the relationship between partner institutions and their students, a third use of the term "recognition" means *the approval or validation of course programmes (as a rule degree programmes) involving components of study abroad by supervising, accreditation or professional licensing agencies*. In many countries, all or specific types of institutions might have to get approval for the total course programme and/or the topics of core courses as well as the areas and modes of examination of their regular course programmes. If study abroad is added to the course programme, approval for the change may be required, because other institutions partially provide the course, the examinations are taken at other institutions and possibly according to other modes, or course content differs from the courses provided at home, which may be mandatory courses in the field of studies concerned. These approvals may be necessary even if the partner institution abroad is unequivocally considered to be equivalent to the home institution, but are likely to be more complicated if the status of the partner institution abroad is not generally accepted as equivalent.

As will be shown below, the requirement for approval of study components abroad is frequently considered not only a tedious administrative burden but as a constraint on arrangements aiming to serve organised study mobility, because the supervising, accrediting or licensing agencies may emphasize homogeneity or even uniformity of course programmes within a country and may want the content of course programmes to be a contribution to the qualification of national functionaries rather than persons qualified to bridge various countries. There are also cases where, on the contrary, the approving agencies legitimize course programmes with components of study abroad which differ substantially from the common national patterns of course programmes as equivalent in principle to the latter.

(4) "Recognition" as certification

The three uses of the term "recognition" discussed up to now refer almost exclusively to internal issues of mobility within higher education institutions and within course programmes. External forces such as agreements by educational ministries, accreditation bodies and professional associations came into play

only if they have the power to restrict the acceptance by the institution of higher education of partial studies at another institution as corresponding to its own study provision; in this case the external institution may play a role in regulating such internal issues. However, institutions of higher education accept and assess the achievements of their students not only internally, but they also certify them and thus indicate to prospective employers, to other institutions of higher education and to the general public that the persons so certified have acquired a certain level of knowledge whose validity is accepted by the institution. Thus "recognition" of partial study in another country - whether by the home or the host institution or any other agency - may ultimately signify public certification of partial study abroad. As will be discussed later, this certification may take various forms ranging from informal written statements to a "double degree".

We suggest that the use of the term "recognition" should be limited to the first two meanings, i.e. the general acceptance and the mechanisms for considering and establishing studies in different countries as corresponding to each other. On the other hand, "approval" of study abroad and "certification" of study abroad are more appropriate descriptions for the third and fourth common usages of the term "recognition".

3. Three Types of Recognition

Recognition in the context of programmes with study abroad - both the principle of acceptance and the mechanisms of recognition - might be classified into three types according to the role which learning prior to the granting of recognition plays for subsequent learning, curricula and examinations:

- recognition of exchange students' studies preceding the study abroad period;
- recognition of successes achieved during the study abroad period as such;
- recognition of prior studies by the partner institution abroad which eventually awards the degree.

(1) Recognition of exchange students' studies preceding the study period abroad

In the framework of temporary study in another country, "recognition" has not only to be granted by the institution to which students return after the study period abroad and at which the degree will eventually be awarded, but *the university hosting students from partner institutions abroad for a limited period of study also has explicitly or implicitly to recognize the previous studies* of these temporary students. Even temporary admission for study with a non-regular status would imply some kind of recognition of prior studies as indicating the appropriate preparation needed for taking part successfully in the courses provided at the host institution. Thus any arrangement between partner institutions for temporarily exchanging students will imply or state such recognition, ranging from general statements of willingness to accept any student sent by the partner institution to active participation of the host institution in setting criteria for selection or even screening prospective incoming students. In a survey of Joint Study Programmes conducted in 1984, 16 percent of programme directors responding reported that their students were subject to a formal recognition procedure in order to be accepted by the partner institution abroad (Dalichow and Teichler, 1986, pp. 42-4).

(2) Recognition of achievement during the study abroad period

Type (2), recognition of the study abroad period is the core issue of recognition in study abroad programmes. It is also at the heart of the criteria governing the granting of ERASMUS support. The respective home university (as a rule the unit in charge of the course programme) sets the conditions and actually grants recognition for a short period of study which home institution

students have undertaken at a partner university abroad. By granting this recognition the home university agrees to recognize a period of study at a partner institution abroad in the context of granting a degree, for the recognized study units are considered equivalent to study periods at home required for the award of a degree, or, in the case of mandatory periods abroad, even as an integral part of the home curriculum. (As will be discussed below, there are models in which study at the host institution abroad is not intended completely to replace studies at the home institution, but to contribute to an extended degree programme).

(3) Recognition of prior studies by partner institution abroad eventually awarding the degree

Up to now we have only discussed concepts of "recognition" according to which the institution of higher education where the degree is awarded (we choose this formulation because the teaching institution is not in all cases the degree-awarding institution) accepts some elements of study at another (partner) institution in another country as corresponding to study it provides itself. In this model of student mobility, study at home remains the rule, and home institutions define the exceptions. Type (3) - recognition of prior studies by partner institutions abroad eventually awarding the degree (or at which the degree will be awarded if the higher education institution does not award degrees itself) - goes further. "Recognition" could imply that *all relevant prior studies* of students at certain institutions of higher education (the partners of the receiving institution) going to another institution in another country will be recognized by the receiving institution not merely for temporary studies there, but for *degree-awarding purposes*. This applies for example,

- if students go to an institution of higher education in another country within a short-term exchange programme and wish finally to remain at the host institution - outside the framework of the organised exchange - and to graduate there;
- if complex programmes of study abroad require students to begin their studies at institution x in country a and graduate at institution y in country b;
- if students are awarded degrees both at the home and the host institution at the completion of a single course programme involving elements of study abroad;
- if institutions of higher education or their respective basic units agree to credit transfer from a range of institutions of other countries, as is the case in the European Community Course Credit Transfer System (ECTS).

The basic meaning of the term and of the procedures for recognition of type (3) does not differ from type (2), but we note a wider scope of recognition: teaching and supervision of the home institution's "own" students is not just offset for a limited time under limiting conditions, but student mobility becomes a guiding principle and replaces the notion that institutions have their "own" students.

4. The Importance of Recognition

Recognition of a period of study at a partner institution in another country of the European Community as corresponding to studies at home is *generally considered to be a very important* element of any student mobility arrangement. Obviously, it is a major factor for stimulating study abroad, and it is crucial for assuring the quality of any provision for study abroad. Four reasons may be stated for the stress on recognition issues, as exemplified by the fact that it is among the criteria for granting ERASMUS support for student mobility.

First, the principle of readiness to accept students and the mechanisms for recognition help to *reduce the risk faced by mobile students* in comparison to the immobile students, notably by eliminating uncertainties as to whether and possibly to what extent study in another country is accepted as corresponding to studies in the home country. Thus, recognition possibly helps to increase the readiness to study abroad.

Second, one of the issues addressed in the previous paragraph which deserves special attention is that recognition of a study period abroad *helps to avoid prolongation* of the overall study period. The students studying abroad for a period should neither bear the burden of additional costs and income foregone nor should they be penalized for being slower in acquiring a degree. For in those countries on the one hand, in which completion of study within the required period of study is customary (for example in the United Kingdom), prolongation is by and large considered an individual failure (leaving aside here degree programmes comprising components of study abroad which are designed to be generally longer than respective programmes without such a component, for example British 4-year degree programmes in European Business instead of 3-year degree programmes in business studies). On the other hand, major political efforts are made to reduce the actual period of study in some of those countries in which long periods are required and additionally some prolongation is customary (for example Denmark, the

Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands and Spain). Thus a substantial expansion of students going abroad for a study period as well as political support for the extension of opportunities for study abroad are more likely if full recognition is granted in most cases and if prolongation of study due to a study period abroad is an exception rather than the rule.

Third, arrangements regarding recognition are *likely to improve the quality of provision for study abroad*, in relation, for example, to administrative support, academic advice, access to all relevant courses at the host institution, and general cooperation between the host institution and the home institution. For each host institution will strive for excellent provisions of study for incoming students from partner institutions, if the persons in charge wish to recognise study abroad by their own students as corresponding to study at home and thus wish their own students to experience an equally demanding and successful study period at the partner institution abroad. Even if programmes do not foresee reciprocity in exchange of students, the respective home institutions are more likely to "push" the host institution to strive for a certain quality of study opportunities for the students hosted, if they want to recognize such a study period abroad as a rule for their own students.

Finally, *genuinely international or genuinely European course components and even complete genuinely international or genuinely European course programmes, i.e. training for international or transnational occupations and other activities, are more likely to be established and more likely to become popular, if they are provided in the framework of regular course programmes.* Training for bridging boundaries would probably remain training for outsiders if it was provided only through extended study periods, advanced course programmes, etc. If European integration progresses further, the importance of this aspect will certainly grow in the near future.

5. Obstacles to Recognition

There are, however, many obstacles regarding recognition, and particularly full recognition of study abroad. One cannot just blame an institution or a member of academic or administrative staff in charge of curricula, examinations, or approval of course programmes for being parochial, if complete recognition of study abroad is not greeted with enthusiasm. Efforts to create conditions of study abroad which merit full recognition are more likely to succeed if potential obstacles are carefully analysed and addressed.

Typical obstacles to recognition of study periods abroad may be grouped into six categories:

- problems as regards living and learning in a foreign country;
- differences in the modes of teaching, learning and assessment between home and host institution;
- discrepancies between the period of study abroad on the one hand and the normal cycles of learning and examinations at the host institution;
- discrepancies in terms of course content between the period of study abroad and what students would have been required to learn at the home institution;
- discrepancies in the quality of education offered by the home and host institution;
- administrative and organizational matters.

The categories chosen refer to the content, character and organization of courses, teaching, learning and living abroad and at home, but not to the persons and institutions presenting or perceiving those obstacles. For example, a course in civil law at a British university might not be recognized as a substitute for a course in civil law at a German university for students wishing to graduate at a German university. In the categories chosen here this issue is considered as "discrepancy in terms of course content" - regardless of which persons or which institutions, following which rules influencing the recognition process (the academic staff of the home university, government, professional bodies, general study regulations, specific course programmes, etc.) perceive such a discrepancy and hold up actual recognition.

(1) Problems as regards living and learning in a foreign country

Three problems of living and learning in a foreign country may reduce the academic outcomes of a study abroad period. First, *limitations of foreign language proficiency* are likely to lead to reduced understanding of what is taught

abroad and consequential to lower achievement. In 1987/88, 98 percent of ERASMUS-supported students went to a host university at which the dominant language differed from that at their home university; probably, only a few percent of students were provided with courses abroad in their own language. If the difficulty of studying in a foreign language is remedied by means of additional language teaching, this may displace the student's pursuit of regular courses. In some cases, foreign students are recommended to attend introductory courses for beginner students which they might follow more easily; those courses, however, are not likely to be considered equivalent to the courses students would have taken at home, if they had not gone abroad. Or special examinations might be administered to students from the partner institutions, taking into account the language barrier; but special examinations of that type are likely to be viewed cautiously by academic staff or supervising agencies, because this also might indicate a somewhat lower academic achievement during a study period in another country.

Second, students might face additional *burdens relating to moving abroad and other temporary arrangements*. Finding suitable accommodation abroad, possibly moving at home, too, and the additional administrative load may by no means be trivial. The ratio of time needed for those activities to the time of study abroad is likely to be high, if the study period abroad is relatively short. Practices vary regarding the extent to which those burdens are offset by administrative support on the part of the home and the host university.

Third, some students might face *integration problems in the host country*: they might suffer from the loss of familiar surroundings at home, and they have difficulties in adapting to different lifestyles, etc. abroad. If the study load is reduced in order to ease integration, this in turn might lead to only partial recognition of the study period abroad.

(2) Differences in the modes of teaching, learning and assessment

Differences in the modes of teaching, learning and assessment between the home and the host universities might cause problems. In the reports written by the ERASMUS programme coordinators this problem is most frequently mentioned. Students might face difficulties in reaching similar levels of achievement at the host universities as at the home institution because of:

- different *types of courses*: lectures, seminars, learning in projects;
- different *types of teaching and learning*: for example, teachers as the main source of information versus active contributions by students;
- different *modes of assessment*: written, oral, multiple-choice examinations, relevance of active class participation for assessment, etc.;

- different *aims and rationales of assessment*: knowledge of facts, understanding theories, ability to criticise concepts, etc.;
- different *ratios of class hours to self-study*;
- different *minimum pass standards*: condoning or not condoning failures in subjects, special pass grades, etc.;
- different provisions and different role of *non-graded courses*;
- differences in emphasis on regular class attendance and in *monitoring of students* in general.

These differences may lead to problems of adjustment for students or to reservations on the part of the universities about considering study abroad as corresponding to study at their own institution, even if students had no visible problems of coping at the host university.

(3) Discrepancies between study abroad periods and cycles of learning and examination periods

Courses at the host institution usually provided for visiting students might require *periods of coherent learning longer than the period of study abroad*. Thus, students might not be admitted to certain courses at the host institution abroad, or they might have to leave the host country before the course is completed, or their achievement might be lower than that of regular participants of such course sequences. Examinations might refer to prior learning and therefore might not be taken successfully by participants in programmes involving study abroad.

(4) Discrepancies in terms of course content

Course content considered indispensable at the home university may not be provided by the partner institution abroad:

- different provisions of courses might be due to *specific curricular emphases* between the home and the host institutions and departments.
- *Nationally oriented knowledge* of a course programme as a rule cannot be replaced by corresponding courses abroad as in the case of courses in law which address specific knowledge of national legislation and jurisdiction.
- *In some cases, we note systematic discrepancies between fields of study* at the home and the host institution. Certain fields of study may have emphases in one country completely different to those they have in another country, even if they are given the same name. Areas of knowledge may be differently divided into course programmes. Fields of study may have a different meaning if studied at home and abroad: for example, the study of

English in the United Kingdom or in Ireland as compared to "English studies" in other countries.

- *International studies may be only partially served in a single host country*. For example, translation students may only study their first foreign language abroad, not however their second foreign language, and therefore get only partial recognition, because the curriculum at home provides for a certain proportion of courses in a second foreign language during that study period.
- Similarly, combinations of disciplines within a course programme which are customary in one country may not be available in other countries. For example, subjects to be taken in teacher training vary, or different arrangements are chosen in combining engineering and business studies.

(5) Discrepancies in the quality of education offered

The persons in charge of a programme (or their supervising, accrediting agencies etc.) might have reservations about the quality of educational provision at the partner institution abroad. One cannot expect that partnerships for student mobility all turn out to be ideal matches in terms of mutual confidence that the quality of educational provision at the partner institution corresponds in every respect to that of the home institution. For example,

- *the partner institution may differ substantially in various respects*: it may be a different type of higher education institution; it may offer course programmes which differ in length to those at the home institution; it may have much lower prestige in its country than the home institution. These substantial differences, which in some cases can be attributed to a bad choice of a partner institution, may occur because no mutual interest in cooperation could be found with an institution abroad which at the outset seemed to be similar to one's own institution.
- *Some courses* at the partner institution may *not be very demanding*.
- *National standards*, for example of prior schooling, or of emphasis in particular areas *may be different*.
- *Different teaching, learning and assessment styles* at the partner institution *may be considered as of low quality in relation to the educational aims of the home institution*, because they do not guarantee the kind of outcomes courses at the home institution are expected to strive for.

Of course, differences between the home and the host institutions in course content, teaching and learning style etc. may be in many cases very beneficial, because they broaden the horizon and relativise traditions within a certain

field of study in the respective countries. However, there are certainly cases in which the differences are of a kind which undermine the quality of learning.

(6) Administrative and organizational issues

Administrative and organizational problems may be obstacles to the recognition of the period of study in another EC country. Just a few of the wide range of such problems mentioned here:

- there may be *limitations imposed in principle in selecting courses abroad.* For example, students may be allowed to select only courses provided at the host university for their respective study years, although other courses might be more suitable for them.
- Students may not be admitted to certain courses abroad needed for recognition at home, because the number of participants is limited; foreign students may have *disadvantages regarding access to* such *courses*, for example because they get to know details of the course provision and modes of access only upon arrival, when students of the host institution have already chosen course programmes.
- *Timing of lecture periods and examinations* at the host university may be different from those at the home university: students arrive abroad when lectures have already started; exams take place when students have already returned home; dates for repeating examinations in the case of failure do not fit, etc.

We do not know how widespread the obstacles are. We also do not claim that this list of obstacles is complete. The examples, however, may suffice in helping to understand that, for instance, a smaller load of courses abroad or reservations of the teaching staff regarding full recognition are not rare phenomena and that considerable effort is needed in order to provide a basis for complete recognition of the study abroad period. According to a survey of Joint Study Programmes conducted in 1985, 33 percent of programme directors reported that they had faced serious problems in negotiating academic recognition arrangements (Conference on Higher Education Cooperation in the European Community, 1985, p. 31). Certainly, the survey mentioned above on selected well-established programmes with study abroad suggests that a substantial proportion of these problems will be overcome. There are, however, no reasons for assuming that the ERASMUS-supported Inter-University Cooperation Programmes faced initially lesser problems in establishing recognition arrangements than Joint Study Programmes had faced in the past.

6. Extent of Recognition

Data on the extent to which recognition is granted for study at a partner university abroad in the framework of the ERASMUS programme are not yet available. In 1984, about half of the programme directors of the "Joint Study Programmes" supported between 1976 and 1984 replied to a questionnaire on recognition issues. Of these 75 percent reported that "normally all work done counts", 19 percent stated partial recognition and 6 percent no recognition for their students (Dalichow and Teichler, 1986, p. 29). In another survey conducted in 1984 of 82 programmes of study abroad in the United Kingdom, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Sweden and the United States, 75 percent of the programme directors stated that "the entire programme" is recognized as a rule; 21 percent percent reported partial recognition and 4 percent no recognition at all (Teichler, Smith and Steube, 1988, p. 142). It may be added, though, that only 62 percent of the students surveyed in the latter study stated upon return that they had been granted or expected to be granted recognition for all their study activities abroad (Teichler and Opper, 1988, p. 72).

In the latter study, only 59 percent of the programme directors stated that their students do not face prolongation of studies; 27 percent reported that the study abroad period entailed prolongation under certain circumstances and 14 percent prolongation in all cases (Teichler, Smith and Steube, 1988, p. 143). Also, only 53 percent of the students reported that they did not expect any prolongation; 23 percent expected a prolongation of one term or semester, and 22 percent a longer prolongation (Teichler and Opper, 1988, p. 73). This indicates that prolongation is common in some programmes or applies to some students individually, even if most or even all academic work successfully done abroad is officially recognized.

It should be noted that most of the programmes referred to in the two surveys mentioned above had operated successfully for a number of years. It is thus justified to assume that incomplete recognition and prolongation of study due to study abroad are more widespread among ERASMUS-supported programmes many of which were established recently and more frequently faced by ERASMUS-supported students than by those surveyed in the above mentioned research projects. The available information on the 1987/88 ERASMUS cohort does not, however, provide any information on which to base an estimate of the extent to which ERASMUS-supported students face greater recognition problems.

The above mentioned findings are stated here because they indicate that full recognition of the academic work done abroad does not necessarily mean

recognition of study abroad as corresponding to the total study load the students would have taken and would probably have successfully completed, if they had studied during that period at the home university. *Full recognition does not correspond to non-prolongation* in the following typical cases:

(a) students complete only part of the courses and examinations abroad successfully, whereby all those successfully completed courses will be recognized. In this case, full recognition only refers to the total of *courses and examinations the student successfully completes*.

(b) Students take fewer courses and examinations at the host university than they were likely to take at home, but more or less all of the courses and examinations taken will be successfully completed and recognized. In this case, full recognition refers to the *total of courses and examinations undertaken*.

(c) The home university designs a programme for its students during the period of study abroad which comprises fewer courses and examinations than are usually expected at home. In this case, full recognition refers to the *programme of courses and examinations institutionally recommended*.

(d) The study abroad period is part of an extended course programme. Recognition of the study abroad period is not or only partially foreseen within a regular course programme within the duration of studies typically required, but rather is considered as an add-on qualification or specific international course programme requiring a longer total period of study. In this case, *full recognition is granted within course programmes requiring more than 100 percent* of what is usually required in a corresponding course programme not comprising study abroad.

On the other hand, we have to bear in mind in this context that partial or non-recognition of the study abroad period does not lead in all cases to prolongation. If, for example, the study period abroad is arranged during the vacation period of the home institution and the courses taken abroad are not mandatory but possibly might offset some courses at home, students not successfully completing all courses abroad nevertheless may graduate after the same period of study at the home institution as they would have taken anyway.

In conclusion we may state that *complete recognition* is realized if academic work usually completed successfully in the study period abroad is formally accepted by the home institution as being equivalent to the amount of *degree-relevant* academic work usually successfully completed in a corresponding period of study at the home institution. It is not clear whether this definition of complete recognition is stricter than the criteria of recognition regarding eligibility of programmes and students for ERASMUS grants. The official documents,

however suggest that the formal requirements of recognition are meant that way.

In evaluating the extent to which recognition is granted, it may be appropriate to use several yardsticks alongside one another. We suggest that evaluation studies choose at least three criteria relevant to recognition:

(a) the extent to which *actual work successfully completed* abroad is recognized,

(b) the extent to which study abroad is counted as *equivalent to work usually performed in a corresponding study period* at the home institution within the regular course programme (no matter to what extent the equivalence is due to a similarity of courses at home or abroad or whether completely different courses abroad are accepted as equally valid alternatives to the course requirements at home),

(c) whether and to what extent the study abroad *leads to a prolongation of total study*.

Additionally, one may ask whether the actual total lecture period is extended (by a study abroad period in vacation time or by an extended period of the whole course programme comprising a study abroad component). One may also ask, whether the actual study load is extended (for example, by additional non-credit courses in foreign languages).

A fourth criterion may be applied:

(d) the extent to which study abroad, if leading to prolongation of studies, is clearly conceived to be a "value added".

The previous discussion avoided terms such as "credit courses", "credited", etc., for if we ask what courses actually are recognized in terms of credits granted, we might overlook those courses abroad which are not credit-courses, as far as certification, assessment, grading etc. are concerned, but are *equivalent to other forms of not formally credited courses at the home institution* which would probably have been taken in a corresponding period abroad and might be considered a regular component of the course programme at the home institution. We have to bear in mind, though, that only if all courses are counted and credited, will exact information regarding the extent of recognition be available.

7. Major Institutional Strategies Regarding Recognition

In the light of the above criteria for complete recognition, many universities clearly grant recognition - partial or complete - in one way or another based on the assumption that academic study abroad will not fully correspond to study at home, as far as the quality and the qualifications to be achieved in the course programme are concerned. The solutions adopted - other than what it hoped remains the most frequent, i.e. striving for complete recognition - may be classified according to seven other recognition strategies, although, of course, the individual university may pursue a mixture of ideal-type strategies, or else may act in a less targeted and deliberate way than the term 'strategy' suggests.

(1) The elitist strategy

In programmes pursuing this strategy, the best students in terms of academic achievement, foreign language proficiency and predicted ability to adjust to life in a foreign educational and social environment are selected for participation in study abroad programmes. This strategy is frequently used if study abroad is optional in a course programme and if the number of those applying for it substantially surpasses the number of study opportunities at partner institutions or the number of grants available.

Moreover, some course programmes incorporating a mandatory period of study abroad choose also such an elitist strategy. In the case of one German study programme at a *Fachhochschule*, even the state law was changed in order to set more demanding admission requirements than those common for admission to *Fachhochschulen* in general.

Thus, if some decline in achievement is expected, its degree is minimised, and it affects only those students who are so successful that some decline as a rule does not endanger the likelihood of their passing.

Such a strategy is likely to ensure that those students acquiring international competencies will be the most capable ones in their cohort. It also reduces the risk of failure. On the other hand, such a strategy only makes limited use of the specific potential of organised programmes (as compared to individual mobility) in mobilising those students who on the basis of their social background, educational profile and motivations have difficulties in overcoming national barriers.

(2) The overload strategy

The students participating in study abroad programmes based on such a strategy are expected to accept a higher load of course work and of other ways of study:

- foreign language courses are provided prior or while abroad or other preparatory courses in addition to the regular course load;
- less stringent course requirements during the study period at the host institution are applied on condition that more courses are taken during other periods at the home institution;
- preparatory programmes or even short periods of study abroad are provided during periods at the home institution when classes are not being held.

The obvious advantage aimed for by the overload strategy is additional learning which make successful learning abroad more likely and diminishes the need for reducing course requirements at home in exchange for courses abroad or for courses related to study abroad. On the other hand, some students taking over such an additional burden might achieve less well in regular courses or might postpone some regular courses, which might even lead to prolongation of their studies. Or the additional burden might be too heavy for some students and thus might turn out to be a selection device for excluding some students for whom study abroad could be a valuable experience.

(3) The add-on strategy (or additional qualification strategy)

This strategy expects the students to prolong the overall period of study:

- for example, a department provides a course programme in international (or "European") business studies alongside a general course programme in business studies, whereby the required duration of the former surpasses that of the latter by one year - a year which students spend abroad partly studying and partly in a work placement.
- In some cases, students are told that their work abroad will be formally recognized but will not offset any course requirements at home. They might be awarded a certificate indicating that they have acquired specific international experiences and qualifications in addition to those usually acquired in the respective course programme (*"Zusatzqualifikation"*).

This strategy circumvents the issue of recognition within a regular course programme. Again, it avoids touching upon the course requirements of the home institution and just expects the students to accept the additional burden - though with some additional offsetting advantages. The overload strategy en-

sures that the quality of learning within the regular study period is not endangered; instead, students have to accept prolongation as a rule in exchange for additional qualifications.

(4) The filling-up the options strategy

Students may be expected to spend their study period in another country doing the work which is not clearly prescribed in their home curricula anyway. They are just expected to trade in some or all of their optional studies at home for the study abroad period:

- for example, students in architecture may have some space in their curriculum for observing architecture; it may be suggested that they spend their study abroad period on such observation activities;
- students in a four-year programme may have course requirements amounting to three-quarters of the total study load usually expected; they may be told that they could take all required courses during the three years at home and all the optional components during the year abroad;
- postgraduate students may have time allotted for the collection of material for their thesis; it is then suggested they use the period abroad that way;
- a period of study abroad during the lecture-free period at the home institution may also be an example of this strategy, for self-study is substituted by additional lectures.

This recognition strategy is most convenient for the home and the host institutions, because its allows recognition without any curtailments of required courses and without intending to increase the total work load of the students. What is left to the discretion of the student anyway, is allocated to his or her study in a foreign environment. This strategy is only feasible if the total course programme is not more or less booked up by required courses and examinations. One could claim that this strategy does not put strong emphasis on the study period in another country as an integral part of the course programme and the qualifications acquired. The students may, however, risk a prolongation if the open periods of the course programmes are used for other purposes, for example for a repetition of required courses, or if the self-study abroad runs into trouble.

(5) The homogenization strategy

In this strategy, the home university tries to ensure that the content of courses during the period abroad is as similar as possible to that of courses at home. Courses required or recommended to be taken abroad might be so similar to those at home that one can establish equivalence almost by identity. Students

may undergo less different experiences and thus face less of an adaptation risk. This strategy obviously eases recognition, but it might foregoe the opportunity of enriching the course programme by contrasting experiences abroad - which may after all be the most important rationale for studying abroad.

(6) The condoning strategy

It may be taken for granted that academic achievements abroad are somewhat less (lower level, fewer courses etc.) than at home, but this is considered legitimate, because instead students are expected to acquire valuable experiences and competencies abroad which are not appropriately measured by the number of courses, or by the successful completion of the same examinations the host students have to pass.

This strategy may be appropriate for students in those course programmes of foreign languages, international business and other fields where socialization in a foreign environment is an integral part of the curricular aims. It might, however, lead to a lowering of academic standards in other cases, for example in highly structured course programmes as well as in those emphasizing formal knowledge.

The condoning strategy might be chosen in order to assure that students are stimulated to go abroad or in order to make the programme eligible for ERASMUS support, even if reservations are widespread among the persons in charge of the course programme regarding the equivalence of the study period abroad to a corresponding period at home. If in fact students' progress abroad was lower than students' progress in the corresponding period at home in those programmes, such a condoning strategy might in the long run harm the reputation of the course programme and subsequently the careers of its graduates.

(7) The limited-recognition strategy

In a substantial number of programmes, reservations against substitution of courses at home by courses at a partner institution abroad, combined with efforts to allow a broad range of enriching study opportunities abroad but coloured by the belief that study abroad is likely to reduce academic progress may lead to limited recognition of the study period abroad. This strategy may be pursued in various ways:

- students may be recommended to take fewer courses abroad than they are expected to take at home. Even if the successful completion of all these courses will be recognized, a prolongation of study will occur;
- courses taken abroad may only partially be considered to correspond to those at home and therefore are only partially recognized;

- a high failure rate regarding the work which has to be produced abroad may be considered a matter of course;
- students may take predominantly non-credit courses abroad or get only pass grades abroad and therefore have less opportunities to complete the number of examinations at home which will be counted for final grading.

This strategy is a transparent option if one comes to the conclusion that complete recognition cannot be granted in the face of the assumed demanding requirements at home and the limited value of study abroad vis-á-vis those requirements. But of all the strategies described, it puts the biggest burden on the students, and it contributes least towards integrating study in another country to study in the home country.

As already stated, we do not know how widespread those strategies are which solve the issue of recognition in a non-optimal way. It would not be surprising, though, if we found that only a relatively small minority of the departments participating in the promotion of ERASMUS-supported student mobility actually grant complete recognition for the whole study period abroad as a rule to their students in the belief that degree award-oriented academic progress abroad is equivalent to academic progress in a corresponding period at home. In presenting this estimate we do not want to challenge the view that recognition should be the key criterion for granting ERASMUS support, given that the importance of recognition for reducing the risks mobile students have to face, for diminishing prolongation of studies, for improving the quality of provision for study abroad and finally for stimulating genuinely international or European course components or complete course programmes of that kind is obvious; therefore, priority support is desirable for programmes which offer a sound basis for complete recognition.

We suggest, though, that a "softly, softly" approach should be taken in assessing recognition in the case of the majority of applications for ERASMUS support. If complete recognition is too strongly emphasized and monitored, this might lead to a bureaucratic vicious circle whereby programmes opportunistically grant recognition in order to ensure support, even if doubt prevails about the equivalence of study abroad to study at home and may even be justified under the given circumstances of the respective programmes. Or rigid strategies may be chosen to ensure recognition by sacrificing - as discussed above - some potential benefits of study abroad, such as educational and social experiences abroad strongly contrasting with those at home and stimulating even many average-achieving and parochial students to spend a period of study abroad.

8. Recognition Problems of ERASMUS-Supported Programmes According to the Reports of Coordinators

Reports by coordinators of the Inter-University Cooperation Programmes supported by the ERASMUS scheme in 1987/88 turned out to be a valuable source for understanding the variety of problems regarding recognition. They are hardly suitable, though, for measuring the extent to which recognition problems occur. Most reports refer to recognition only briefly, the way issues are addressed not homogenously enough to allow quantitative estimates, moreover we can certainly assume that not all programme directors will expose the problems encountered because some might fear that this might lead to a discontinuation of support. Finally, the 1987/88 cohort is clearly likely to have been an atypical year for the development of the ERASMUS programme.

In comparison we may mention the respective findings of a survey on "Joint Study Programmes" conducted in 1985. Serious difficulties were reported by 33 percent of the programme directors both in negotiating academic recognition arrangements and in obtaining approval for academic recognition arrangements. Differences in course content (36 %) and discrepancies in timetables and dates of terms (38 %) were mentioned more frequently as problems, whereas discrepancies in assessment and examination procedures (22 %) were considered less frequently to have been problems (Conference on Higher Education Cooperation in the European Community, 1985, p. 30-1).

In 7 percent of the reports covering student mobility presented by the ICP coordinators in 1987/88, problems of recognition were addressed. A further 13 percent of the reports indicated substantial problems of disparity of courses or teaching and learning between the host and the home institution; we may assume that in most of these cases they have caused problems of recognition as well. A further 3 percent emphasized substantial problems of assessment, which again are most likely to have caused problems of recognition as well. Thus, we note more than 20 percent of ICP reports in which some recognition problems show up directly or indirectly.

The major issues addressed cannot be easily incorporated into the preceding analysis, because the dimensions which are addressed in the reports vary. Nevertheless, it can be worthwhile to indicate the problems presented.

(1) In the context of recognition, issues of *disparity of content and structure of course programmes* are most frequently mentioned. Learning at home and learning abroad are considered not to match sufficiently in order to allow complete recognition.

(2) *Underlying rationales as well as modes of assessment and examinations* are mentioned in second place as a barrier to recognition: whether merely facts are addressed or modes of thinking, whether assessment is purely knowledge-oriented or tries to incorporate issues of motivation and personality, whether exams refer strictly to the content of a certain course or to broader components of the course programme, whether written or oral examinations dominate, how students can adapt to the assessment styles of the examiners, etc.

(3) It is interesting to note that in almost half of cases in which issues of curricular disparity or assessment disparity are referred to, the authors of the reports do not talk about problems encountered with a partner institution, but *rather about disparities between the national characteristics of higher education systems*. Obviously, most problems observed are not considered to be due to the specific characteristics of the individual universities and departments involved.

(4) Similarly, there were several complaints that *governments or other supervisory agencies in charge refused to accept the arrangements made* and prevented the institutions from recognizing the study abroad period. This was among the most frequent recognition problems to be mentioned.

(5) Both in critical remarks regarding curricular disparity and in those referring to national barriers to recognition, one issue was frequently mentioned: if course programmes are rigidly structured by an *abundance of compulsory courses* as well as by a *high number of examinations* regularly taken, arrangements regarding the period of study abroad can hardly succeed in ensuring complete recognition. Conversely, successes of programmes involving study abroad may have the effect of challenging rigid curricular structures even in course programmes not comprising study abroad.

(6) *Discrepancies in the duration of learning and assessment periods* at the host institution as compared with that of the period of study abroad as well as problems of a mismatch in the *exact timing* of the study abroad and that of courses and examinations at the host university were addressed in several cases. In some cases, the timing issue was closely linked to disparities in content of courses or that of examination modes prior to the period of study abroad.

(7) *Low achievement of students* during study abroad is referred to as an impediment to recognition in several reports. In almost all cases, however, students are not directly blamed for their failure, but rather lack of monitoring, misleading advice, curricular rigidity requiring too many courses and too many examinations, etc. are seen as responsible.

Apart from these seven major themes, a broad range of issues is addressed only here and there in the more than 300 reports checked for this brief account of recognition issues. The sources available do not allow us to conclude whether those additional issues are singular or deserve attention as typical ones in the framework of European student mobility.

9. Educational and Administrative Provisions of the Programme as the Basis of Recognition Arrangements

The ERASMUS scheme promotes student mobility in Member States of the European Community predominantly in the framework of "organized" or "integrated" programmes of study abroad. Whereas individually mobile students might only expect limited administrative and academic support on the part of their home university, study abroad programmes - such as the Inter-University Cooperation programmes stimulated and supported by the ERASMUS scheme - cooperate in a variety of ways and provide students with many kinds of educational and administrative support aimed at easing the process of going abroad and returning, at increasing the quality of experience and learning abroad and at ensuring a high degree of recognition. In this context, recognition is an aim in itself and is served by recognition arrangements as such; recognition, however, is closely linked to any other educational and administrative support provided in such programmes, the better this support works regarding the process of going abroad and returning as well as regarding the experience of living and learning abroad, the more learning abroad is likely to be successful and eventually to be recognized or otherwise as equivalent to what is learned at home. (Conversely, as already argued above, sound recognition arrangements might encourage institutions of higher education to improve other organizational arrangements in ICPs.)

If we try to map the various educational and administrative provisions noted in Inter-University Cooperation Programmes, we may establish *three dimensions*:

- the content of activities or learning processes addressed in educational and administrative provisions;
- the stages or sequences relating to the periods of study abroad for which those arrangements are provided;
- the methods used to implement the provisions.

(1) Content of activities and learning processes addressed

ICPs may address five content areas:

- *academic*, i.e. the core area of teaching, learning, assessment and degree-granting at universities;
- *foreign language*, i.e. the 'tool' of understanding in a foreign country;
- *cultural*, i.e. knowledge, understanding and experience of culture and society, customs and traditions, values and lifestyles, the political and economic system, arts, literature and media etc. of the host country, and the potential thereof for reflecting and relativizing the home culture;
- *social/personal*, i.e. communication and ways of cooperation, social and personal adaptation in a changed social environment, stability of personality and identity, etc.;
- *administrative/organizational*, such as travelling, registration, accommodation, financing of studies, etc.

(2) Stages of provision for study abroad

The second dimension is that of stages or sequences relating to the period of study abroad:

- *Pre-decision stage:* In this stage, students are informed in various ways by the university about opportunities for study abroad and in order to make their minds up whether they wish to participate (in the case of mandatory study abroad periods such a pre-decision stage predates entry to higher education).
- *Participation decision stage:* Usually some time before the actual start of the period of study abroad, a (provisional) decision is taken about possible participants. Students may have to apply to be selected, if the number of applicants considerably surpasses that of study abroad opportunities or of financial support available or if they opt individually.
- *Preparatory stage:* As a rule, students are recommended to prepare themselves carefully for some months or even for more than a year for their period of study abroad. The university might provide courses, meetings, counselling, written material and support services during this period as regards all the content dimensions named above.
- *Departure and arrival stage:* During departure and arrival periods, notably administrative and organizational matters play an important role, travel, accommodation and registration are the most obvious issues. Additionally, it is conventional wisdom that perception and understanding of a foreign culture, social and personal adaptation to life and study abroad, motivation and opportunities for academic study abroad etc. are substantially shaped

during this transitory stage: therefore, we note a broad range of other provisions as well at this time, in some cases even an introductory seminar lasting several days and aiming to combine academic introduction, first cultural experience and the establishment of social contacts abroad.

- The *major part of the study period abroad*, i.e. the whole period of learning abroad in courses or other continuous learning settings except those periods at the beginning and at the end of the period abroad discussed above and which are essentially transitional: Obviously academic provision plays the most important role in this period, although supplemented by various other arrangements.
- *Termination of study abroad and return-stage:* in contrast to the transition from the home to the host university, students are provided with less support at the time of transition back to the home institution. On the other hand, arrangements regarding assessment, certification and recognition upon return are associated with the final transition.
- *Reintegration stage:* Back at the home university students may seek, and be provided with, advice as regards how to match their studies abroad to subsequent study at home. Students may also be asked to report about their experiences, thus ensuring feedback for the future development of the programme. Different views prevail as regards the extent of academic, social and personal adjustment problems of returning students and the role reintegration programmes may play in easing the process. In some cases, arrangements may be made at this stage for the repetition of courses or examinations which students have failed abroad.
- *Final examination and degree-granting stage:* The academic learning increment during the period abroad may again be specifically addressed in the period of final examination, assessment and degree-awarding. In some cases, academic staff of the host institution participate in the final assessment process. Practices of counting performance abroad in final assessment vary substantially. Finally, the study abroad period as such may be explicitly certified in additional certificates or mentioned in diploma documents or even in the award of a double-degree, i.e. degrees both at the home and host university.

(3) Methods of making arrangements for study abroad

The third dimension refers to the methods of making educational and organisational arrangements for study abroad:

- *information and orientation:* for example provision of documents, oral information;

- *counselling, guidance, advice;*
- provision of *courses and teaching;*
- *direct support services:* for example, arrangements for renting a room, provision of financial support, etc;
- *monitoring, assessment, certification, and recognition.*

Each of the various educational and administrative support activities can be assigned to one of more of these three dimensions and is frequently named accordingly. A preparatory foreign language course, for example, offers foreign language knowledge as content, is provided in the preparatory stage, and is offered by means of a course. The categories may not be clearly separated, for example an orientation course might serve academic, cultural and administrative purposes concurrently, selection may take place after preparatory courses, and a provision of lists of rooms for rent may be understood both as an information device and as a direct support service. Nevertheless, these categories are quite suitable for mapping all the educational and administrative arrangements by the home and host universities made in order to shape the period of study abroad and thus to create directly and indirectly a frame for its recognition.

In the subsequent discussion of provisions shaping recognition we will refer to *academic provisions*, since these directly set conditions for recognition, as well as to issues of assessment, internal certification, harmonization etc. which are direct components of the recognition process as such. This emphasis on academic issues of study abroad and their implications on recognition seems to be appropriate, because the prevailing mode of ICPs is that of cooperating departmental units aiming to achieve at least some degree of *curricular integration*, i.e. provisions ensuring that what is learned abroad fits the 'course menu' of the home curricula.

The specific character of this *European approach to study abroad* emerged in the "Joint Study Programmes", the predecessor of the ERASMUS scheme. In contrast to the dominant mode of programmes of study abroad in the U.S., Joint Study Programmes

- were *organised on departmental level*, whereas U.S. programmes were organized on university level,
- *emphasized academic achievement* more strongly, and only to a lesser extent cultural and personality-related aims compared with the U.S. programmes,
- *emphasized curricular development in terms of a certain overall 'Gestalt' or 'menu' of the total course programme in which the study abroad plays a distinct role* rather than a 'cafeteria approach' of a course programme in which a broad range of single courses might be incorporated and a broad range of credits might be collected (see the analysis of Joint Study Programmes in

contrast to the U.S. model in Smith, 1979; Baron and Smith, 1987; Teichler and Smith, 1988).

Probably the major aims associated with study abroad, the curricular emphasis and the major administrative responsibility are closely interlinked. For example, we may assume that the character of study abroad in Europe would change dramatically, if the ERASMUS programme did not predominantly stimulate cooperation between departments rather than cooperation between the central levels of universities. In the latter case, we could predict that administrative refinement, the aims of cultural and personality development, 'cafeteria'-like credit concepts etc. would gain more popularity at the expense of emphasis on academic goals and curricular integration. We would argue that such a shift of emphasis would diminish efforts for curriculum development towards new European and international qualification profiles.

Before discussing different curricular emphases in ERASMUS-supported programmes, it seems appropriate at this point to mention the possible *overlap of academic learning abroad on the one hand and foreign language learning, cultural and social learning as well as personality development abroad on the other hand.* Systems of higher education vary in the Member States of the European Community in the extent to which higher education is expected explicitly to serve cultural enrichment, experience-related learning, personality development, etc. as well as the function of knowledge transmission and teaching, i.e. theories, facts, methods, which emphasize the cognitive domain. These differences nothwithstanding, a broad consensus seems to have emerged that study abroad incorporates a strong potential regarding the former. For example, programme directors frequently point out, and surveys tend to support the view, that students have "matured" during the period abroad, broadened their capacity for reflection, learned to cope with hitherto unknown environments, persons and tasks, etc. This is very important as regards recognition, because recognition of study abroad might be more limited if the yardstick for recognition is exactly the same as that used for assessing study progress at home, or might be less limited or even complete, if maturing, a broader reflection, the ability to cope with the unknown etc. are considered as valuable outcomes which in the recognition procedure might substitute to some extent academic achievements. Accordingly, recognition procedures which condone a few academic courses in exchange for those other achievements might be considered appropriate.

This study, however, does not pursue this issue in detail. As already indicated, we will discuss major strategies of academic provisions in periods of study abroad and their implications for recognition. It certainly would be worthwhile, though, to analyse the views existing in ERASMUS-supported

programmes as regards such a comprehensive yardstick for progress abroad and its recognition by the home university.

10. Curricular Arrangements Relevant to Recognition

Results of previous surveys may help to explain the links between curricular arrangements and recognition. In the questionnaire survey conducted in 1984 regarding recognition issues in "Joint Study Programmes", evidence was provided that curricular arrangements might play a substantial role in relation to recognition (Dalichow and Teichler, 1986). For example, the survey showed that students going abroad in the framework of programmes in which academic courses to be taken abroad were completely predetermined were much more likely to be granted complete recognition than in programmes in which courses abroad were only partly or not at all predetermined. The survey also indicated that recognition was more likely in programmes in which student exchange is highly formalized, for example in terms of a formal procedure at the host university in accepting students selected from the home institution or in terms of comprehensive written statements by the host university about the achievement of the students during their study period abroad.

In the research project mentioned above, which covers study abroad in five countries, it was possible to analyse the relationships between programme characteristics and the degree of recognition actually granted to students (Teichler, Smith and Steube, 1988, Chapter 10). We noted that a relatively high degree of recognition was realized if

- academic progress was a strongly emphasized goal (rather than emphasis on foreign language proficiency, cultural goals, personality development and career prospects);
- courses to be taken abroad were largely predetermined;
- the study abroad period was mandatory for the students of the respective course programme;
- home and host university closely cooperated both regarding curricula and other issues.

In addition, substantial guidance and administrative support for the study period abroad are frequently provided by programmes eventually leading to a high degree of recognition. Finally, recognition seems to be more carefully arranged and eventually granted in programmes expecting students to spend one

year or even a longer period abroad rather than in programmes comprising a short period abroad.

Most of those findings suggest that tight curricular regulation, close institutional cooperation, a multitude of support and advice arrangements, as well as detailed administrative processes regarding assessment are the most promising mechanisms in assuring recognition. Before turning such findings into recommendations, however, one should also take into account some of their limitations. First, the second survey mentioned shows that only a few of such programme characteristics significantly lead to higher academic achievement or to lesser academic problems according to the self-rating of the participating students. This suggests that a high degree of recognition might be in some cases the outcome of a bureaucratic circle rather than due to proven achievement: if the programme of study abroad is highly organized in various respects, the recognition process is much more likely to be spelled out in detail and recognition is more likely to be formally granted, even if achievement abroad is not more impressive than in programmes less highly organized and formalized. Second, the first survey mentioned above showed that there was a minority of less than 10 percent of "Joint Study Programmes" which emphasized openness and flexibility in almost every respect: students were free to choose courses abroad, and emphasis was placed on experiences abroad strongly constrasting those at home; students could expect that study abroad was considered equivalent to study at home, even if formal recognition of academic achievement abroad played a limited role.

We do not want to speculate further what academic or academically-related characteristics of programmes of study abroad most likely lead to complete recognition. Rather, we would like to present some dimensions of such programme characteristics which might indicate important options for shaping such programmes and certainly have to be considered in recognition arrangements. The five major dimensions worth mentioning are:

- degree of curricular integration,
- specific certification and double-degree awards,
- mandatory versus optional participation in study abroad,
- degree of contrast or similarity between study abroad and study at home, and
- degree of prescription of study abroad.

(1) Degree of curricular integration

Many departmental units participating in ERASMUS-supported Inter-University Cooperation Programmes do not merely develop concepts concerning the content and character of courses taken abroad which could be considered equivalent to courses at home, but go a substantial step further: they arrive at concepts of how study in another country could be conceived as an integral part of the course programme at home. Learning abroad is no longer an alien element, which somehow has to be fitted in or labelled as corresponding to what is learned at home, but rather is conceived to be part of the course programme as such.

Though the borderline between study abroad as an external element or an integral part of a course programme might not be clearly established, the conceptual difference is by no means trivial. In the five-country survey mentioned above, 90 percent of the German programmes supported reported that their students as a rule did not face prolongation of study due to the study period abroad; the emphasis of the JSP programmes in stimulating curricular integration (see Baron and Smith, 1987, chapter 7) seemed to work. On the other hand, only 30 percent of the other German programmes surveyed reported that students as a rule did not face prolongation (Teichler, Smith and Steube, 1988, p. 143); most of these programmes had been supported in the framework of "Integrated Study Abroad" by the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD). This DAAD programme stimulated recognition arrangements, but not any direct efforts towards curricular integration.

Efforts aimed at curricular integration may include a high degree of predetermination of courses to be taken abroad, detailed regulations regarding assessment, mandatory participation of students or even a joint double degree award. We would warn, however, against confusing this with *"curricular integration"* as such which we prefer to define as *a curricular concept according to which study abroad is an integral part of the conceptual framework of the study course at home*. We suggest this concept be separated from the other dimensions mentioned because there are programmes with study abroad which are considered to be integrated components of study at home, though there are neither detailed prescriptions regarding courses to be taken abroad nor detailed procedures regarding assessment and recognition.

(2) Specific certification and the award of double degrees

Specific certification of study abroad upon completion of the course programme, or a double degree awarded by both the home and host institution, or a joint "European" degree, as recently suggested by some programmes, are certainly the most visible public signs of curricular integration envisaged or re-

alized. The survey of "Joint Study Programmes" conducted in 1984 showed that 7 percent provided a certificate, additional to the diploma document, referring to the study abroad period. A total of 13 percent referred explicitly to study abroad in the diploma document, while 30 percent supplied the students with some kind of certification which was not part of the official diploma document, 50 percent did not certify the study abroad at all. Some 12 percent of programme directors of Joint Study Programmes stated that all of their students received a final degree from both the host and the home institution; a further 12 percent stated that students could receive the diploma of both institutions, if they fulfilled the course and examination requirements of both institutions, and in a further 8 percent of programmes students could be granted both degrees, if they took some additional courses and examinations (Dalichow and Teichler, 1986, pp. 72-5).

In reports provided by the ERASMUS-supported Inter-University Cooperation Programme coordinators in 1987/88, less than 3 percent stated that a double-degree was awarded. This substantially lower percentage is not surprising, because many newly established cooperation programmes between institutions of higher education which were supported in the first year of the ERASMUS programme were less ambitious, however, as far as curricular integration was concerned. One should bear in mind that the percentage of students going abroad with an ERASMUS grant in the framework of a programme leading to a double degree was much higher, given that those programmes usually send abroad a substantial number of students.

As a rule, the programmes leading to a double degree require all students on the course programme concerned or at least those studying in the corresponding field to spend a study period of at least one year abroad. They provide for elaborate preparation. Academic staff of the partner institutions negotiate the whole course programme, not merely the respective periods of study abroad. They set up detailed schemes of assessment and internal certification, whereby in many cases joint assessment procedures are established.

(3) Mandatory periods of study abroad

Some programmes require all students on a course to spend a period at a partner institution abroad; the number of these programmes seems to be lower than that of those leading to a double-degree. As a rule, curricular arrangements for course programmes comprising a mandatory study period abroad are such that complete recognition is more or less ensured.

On the one hand, mandatory programmes can more easily ensure curricular integration and complete recognition than other programmes, because each preparatory course and each course abroad in principle can be incorporated

into the regular course programme, since there is no necessity to establish equivalences of courses and achievements for students going abroad as compared to those not going abroad. On the other hand, mandatory programmes have to ensure that just as many students can successfully master a course programme comprising a substantial period of study abroad as those course programmes that do not. Thus, the issue of curricular integration is much more of a key issue programmes for mandatory than for optional study abroad.

(4) Degree of similarity or contrast between study abroad and at home

Both the applications and reports by ERASMUS-supported Inter-University Programmes as well as previous surveys provide little information on one important issue related to the academic philosophy of study abroad programmes: to what extent learning abroad should substantially contrast with learning at the home institution. Many descriptions of recommendations of what courses the students should take abroad and of rationales underlying recognition indicate that the contrast between what should be learned abroad and what is learned at home is kept within limits (except for the course programmes considered to be training for international professions), if complete recognition is envisaged. Again, this finding suggests that too strict enforcement of the criteria of complete recognition in the framework of the ERASMUS programme could have counterproductive consequences: some programmes would probably prescribe courses to be taken abroad in such a way, that contrast between learning experience abroad and at home would be further reduced.

(5) Degree of prescription of study abroad

The survey conducted on "Joint Study Programmes" in 1984 showed that in 31 percent of the programmes all the courses to be taken abroad were prescribed. In 56 percent of the programmes, courses abroad were in part mandatory, and in part students could choose. In 13 percent of the programmes, the students were completely free to choose which courses they wished to attend (Dalichow and Teichler, 1986, pp. 63-4).

It is obvious that the establishment of a mandatory programme of courses to be taken abroad eases the assessment of academic progress abroad by the home institution because assessment has to focus only on the level of individual achievement in a given set of courses, rather than on the equivalence of courses. Also, students know with greater certainty how they can reach complete recognition. On the other hand, a complete prescription of the courses to be taken abroad might only be considered to be legitimate, if the home university is willing to recognise academic progress abroad along those lines completely; this easing of the individual recognition decision thus requires a con-

sistent concept of equivalence of study abroad to that at home. Moreover, such a strategy might discourage individual initiatives in searching for contrasting educational experiences abroad.

We assume that many ERASMUS-supported Inter-University Cooperation Programmes are still in a process of experimentation and are searching for solutions regarding content and structures of academic learning in study abroad as far as they can be influenced by cooperation between partner institutions and by regulations set for students. Information on prior experiences acquired by Joint Study Programmes and on other programmes of study abroad regarding the range of options and their implications certainly would be helpful for such decisions, though no simple recipes for success can be expected to emerge from analysis of it.

11. Assessment and Recognition Procedures

A student enrolled at another university for a brief period might receive some kind of internal certification of individual courses taken and examinations passed and might hand those documents over to her or his home university requesting acceptance of such proven achievement as corresponding to courses and examinations by those taken who stay at the home institution. It is obvious, though, that most programmes include regular recognition arrangements for study abroad. These more or less formalised arrangements are expected to function as a guideline for students, to provide them with a kind of guarantee of recognition opportunities and to ease the regular process of recognition. The burden and the problems involved in establishing such recognition arrangements eventually lead to a stability and ease procedures for recognition.

Most reports provided by the Inter-University Cooperation Programme coordinators do not refer to the modes of assessment and recognition. We might assume, though, that practices do not differ in principle from those previously realized by Joint Study Programmes; therefore, we report the respective findings of the JSP survey and of the previously mentioned five-country survey which also comprised JSPs. One should bear in mind, though, that most the JSPs surveyed in 1984 had already operated for a considerable period and had put substantial emphasis on curricular integration. Therefore, it is justified to assume that their arrangements were on average more elaborate than those of the average ERASMUS-supported departmental units cooperating in ICPs in 1987/88.

The following - obviously not mutually exclusive - types of arrangements regarding recognition can be observed:

- formal agreement on recognition between the partners abroad and at home;
- comprehensive assessment of academic progress abroad by the host university;
- overall certification of the courses, exams and grades abroad;
- "automatic" initiation of recognition procedures by the home university upon return;
- (repeated) assessment of achievement abroad by the home institution;
- award of formal equivalence;
- provisions for repetition of exams or other ways of compensating failures abroad;
- making completion of a study abroad period a prerequisite for final examination of the course programme;
- reference to study abroad in the final examinations and final assessment.

In the decision-making processes as regards recognition, various actors may play a role:

- agreements and final decisions on recognition do not necessarily remain at departmental level; the central university level, external agencies etc. may be involved;
- host and home institution may cooperate both in assessment and certification regarding the period of study abroad and upon return, and with regard to subsequent study at the home institution.

(1) Formal agreement on recognition

Some institutions like to establish a formal agreement on recognition with their partners abroad. A total of 40 percent of the JSP programme directors reported that their recognition procedures were based on such formal agreements. Only in one of nine cases, those formal agreements concluded merely between the respective *departments*; usually the *universities* and in a few cases *other bodies* concluded such agreements. In 52 percent of the cases in which an agreement was concluded, it had to be approved by an external agency, in almost half of those cases even by external agencies both of the home and the host country (Dalichow and Teichler, 1986, pp. 56-8).

(2) Comprehensive assessment by the host institution

In various programmes achievement during the study period abroad is assessed comprehensively while the students are at the host university. Of the programmes surveyed in the five-country research project, 29 percent expected the students to sit a final *written examination* at the host university; in 17 percent of programmes, an *oral examination* took place at the host university (Teichler, Smith and Steube, 1988, pp. 138-9). In some of these cases, representatives of the home university participated in the assessment process.

(3) Overall certification of performance abroad

In many cases, the host institution is expected to provide a written document about the overall performance of a student during the study abroad period - regardless of whether a comprehensive assessment takes place or not. In the five-country survey mentioned above, 22 percent of the programme directors reported that students had to get such a certificate to be taken into account in the recognition process (Teichler, Smith and Steube, 1988, p. 135). According to the JSP survey conducted in 1984, a certificate from the partner institution abroad was provided in 25 percent of the programmes, whereby a quarter *certified attendance only* and three quarters *assessed the performance abroad* (Dalichow and Teichler, 1986, p. 46).

(4) Automatic initiation of recognition procedures

In many cases, students themselves do not have to initiate any administrative process in order to be granted recognition. Automatic recognition procedures were reported by 65 percent of the respondents in the 1984 JSP survey (Dalichow and Teichler, 1986, pp. 29-30) and by 68 percent of the respondents in the five-country study (Teichler, Smith and Steube, 1988, p. 134).

(5) Assessment of achievement and recognition upon return

Decisions about the correspondence or equivalence of study abroad to that at home are in most cases solely based on performance abroad as certified (by an overall certificate or by certificates on specific activities) by the partner institution. In the 1984 JSP survey, 70 percent of the directors of programmes granting recognition reported that decisions were made *solely on information provided by the partner institution*, whereby 42 percent reported global recognition and 28 percent recognition of individual courses, exams, etc. The second most frequent procedure reported is an *examination set by the home institution upon return*, which in most cases addresses the overall achievement abroad

(10 %) and in a few cases (3 %) only individual courses etc. (Dalichow and Teichler, 1986, pp. 32-3).

The actual *responsibility for ultimately deciding whether study abroad is recognized at home* usually rests with the department responsible for the course programme. In the 1984 JSP survey mentioned, however, 24 percent of the programme directors reported that this responsibility lay outside the department, with central authorities of the university (16 %) and external agencies (3 %) being most frequently mentioned (Dalichow and Teichler, 1986, pp. 58-9).

(6) Award of formal equivalence

Recognition may be realized in an informal manner. Many persons in charge of programmes of study abroad, however, prefer a formal recognition in order to settle issues of recognition clearly and let the students know the implications for subsequent study at the home institution. According to the respondents of the JSP survey conducted in 1984, formal equivalence was awarded upon return in 60 percent of the programmes granting recognition, whereas in 40 percent of the cases less formal procedures were chosen for exempting students partly or completely from work at the home institution (Dalichow and Teichler, 1986, pp. 54-6).

(7) Provisions for repetition

If students fail to fulfil the requirements in one or more elements of their study abroad, they may not only face prolongation, but they might even not be able to complete the overall course programme, if, for example, courses only offered abroad are to be considered requirements of the course programme at home. Therefore, a need is widely felt for establishing regulations for compensation of failure abroad, for example, repeated examinations or alternative course requirements. In the five-country survey, 56 percent of the programme directors reported the establishment of such regulations regarding additional courses, repeated examinations etc. (Teichler, Smith and Steube 1988, pp. 136-7). It is interesting to note the host institutions play no role in assessing the students' performance in such repeated examinations.

(8) The role of study abroad in final assessment

If study abroad is completely or partially recognized, it contributes at least indirectly to the award of the degree in fulfilling certain prerequisites for the final assessment or the final examination of the respective course programme at the home university. If a period of study abroad is a mandatory component

of the course programme, it will be at least a direct prerequisite for final assessment. In many cases, however, the study abroad plays a direct role in final assessment; this was true in 55 percent of the JSP programmes for which information was provided in the 1984 survey. The most frequent modes in the Joint Study Programmes were the following:

- Students' academic records abroad contributed to the final grades (50 % of the JSPs for which information was available).
- Topics studied during the stay abroad were tested in the framework of the final examinations (26 %).
- Examiners from the partner institution were involved in the examination and in the grading of the thesis (13 %; see Dalichow and Teichler, 1986, pp. 70-2).

In the case of double-degree programmes, even the final examination may be taken abroad and may count as the final examination of the home university as well.

12. Some Practical Implications

This study could only briefly refer to experiences reported in 1987/88 by coordinators of ERASMUS-supported Inter-University Cooperation Programmes, because most of these reports only briefly touch upon recognition issues; no survey has yet been undertaken on recognition modes and recognition problems related to ERASMUS-supported student mobility. Oral reports at various meetings, extensive reports of some programmes as well as surveys on the Joint Study Programmes, and other programmes of study abroad, however, reveal typical modes of recognition and typical problems of performance in study periods abroad related to recognition upon return.

Though this study aims to be almost exclusively analytical in its approach, it has various practical implications. It is hoped that a *systematization of concepts* and modes of recognition as well as of problems regarding recognition might provide useful information for persons in charge of programmes of study abroad still in a stage of initial development and experimentation or in the process of being established. We believe that a conceptual systematization as presented here, along with reports about a variety of individual successful cases as well as recommendations by practitioners in this area might help to

build new arrangements based on prior experience. Thus, it might help to establish what acceptable modes and levels of recognition could be.

We would suggest that a *limitation be imposed on the inflationary use of the term recognition*. We suggest the use of "recognition" be restricted to the acceptance of study at another institution as corresponding to study at the institution under consideration, whereby the term might be used for addressing the principle of readiness to accept study abroad as corresponding to study at home as well as the regulations and processes of translating and transferring performance abroad to performance expected at home. Thus, recognition, as a rule, would refer to the study period abroad, but also possibly to studies preceding the study abroad period and recognition of prior studies in the case of a move to another institution at which the student wishes to be awarded a degree. What should be excluded (i.e. not be named recognition), though, are the approval of study by an external agency, as well as the public certification, for example, with the help of certificates supplementing the diploma-document or by means of a double-degree awarded by both the host and the home university.

We would like to emphasize the *variety and serious nature of obstacles to recognition*. Problems of living and learning in a foreign country (including those of learning and taking exams in a foreign language), of experiencing different modes of teaching, learning and assessment, of discrepancies between study abroad periods and cycles of learning and examinations abroad as well as discrepancies in course content, discrepancies in quality between partner institutions and finally administrative and organizational problems all have to be mentioned in this context. Even among directors of Joint Study Programmes which may have been on average more elaborate than the ERASMUS-supported Inter-University Cooperation Programmes, one third reported serious difficulties in negotiating recognition strategies; and in a survey conducted on programmes of study abroad in the United Kingdom, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Sweden and the United States only 59 percent of the programme directors reported that students as a rule did not face prolongation, and only 53 percent of the students stated upon return that they did not expect prolongation of their studies as a consequence of studying abroad for a period.

We suggest that it would be advisable to *reflect upon the implications of recognition strategies*. A surprisingly wide range of strategies exist - although we do not know how frequently they are employed in the framework of the ERASMUS programme - either to accept limited recognition, to lower standards to some extent, to accept prolongation, to expect a substantial additional work load on students, or to restrict the latter's opportunities in searching for learning experiences which substantially contrast with those at home. We classified them as elitist strategy, overloadstrategy, add-on strategy, filling up the

options strategy, homogenization strategy, condoning strategy, and the limited recognition strategy.

In pointing to considerable recognition problems we do not suggest that recognition be abandoned as a key criterion for granting ERASMUS support. Recognition of the study period abroad is important in reducing the risks faced by mobile students, especially those mobile in the framework of a cooperation programme between institutions of higher education of different Member States of the European Community, and also in helping to avoid prolongation. Moreover, educational and administrative measures which help to assure the quality of study abroad are more likely to be taken if support for the programme is linked to recognition. Finally, reward for recognition has certainly stimulated the establishment of genuinely international and European course programmes. Nor should the ERASMUS scheme set too rigid criteria as regards recognition in granting support. For this might lead to a bureaucratic vicious circle whereby programmes opportunistically grant recognition in order to ensure support, even if doubt prevails about the full equivalence of study abroad to study at home, and thus undermine in the long run the quality and reputation of course programmes involving components of study abroad. These observations rather tend to support the current practice of the ERASMUS scheme in *giving some priority to well-arranged and highly integrated programmes* which appropriately grant complete recognition as a rule, *but alongside this, deliberately also grant support to a broad range of programmes usually leading to a lesser degree of recognition*. One might discuss, though, whether a more deliberate approach should not perhaps be taken by explicitly subdividing the support awarded according to different criteria.

This report points out *various possible meanings of full or complete recognition* and suggests that at least three terms of reference be applied in evaluating recognition. For example, full recognition might refer to all the courses the students have successfully taken abroad, to all the courses the students have taken or to the programme of courses the students were invited or required to take abroad, where the actual activity abroad might comprise less courses, less examinations or might be otherwise less demanding than that at home. Or study abroad might only be recognized as an add-on qualification or within the framework of a special course programme which requires a longer period of study than a corresponding course programme without study abroad. Therefore, we suggest that "complete" recognition be regarded as having been achieved if academic work usually done successfully in the period of study abroad is formally accepted by the home institution as being equivalent to the amount of academic work usually successfully done in a corresponding period of study at the home institution.

In order to take into account the various existing meanings and terms of reference, we suggest that any further evaluation studies should choose at least three criteria regarding recognition: (a) the extent to which actual work successfully completed abroad is recognized; (b) the extent to which study abroad is counted or considered equivalent to work usually performed in a corresponding study period at the home institution within the regular course programme; (c) whether and to what extent the study abroad period leads to a prolongation of study. Additionally, one might try to measure to what extent prolongation of studies due to study abroad may lead to a "value added" component.

On the other hand, credits granted should not be taken as a yardstick, because those courses and other academic activities would be overlooked which are not formally credited, but considered equivalent to courses and other study activities at home which though not credited are expected to be taken.

We suggest that recognition issues *per se* should not be overemphasized in the process of developing programmes of study abroad, but that the emphasis should be put rather on a range of *measures appropriate to serve the quality of learning abroad which in turn will serve the recognition of what was learned abroad*. For if most emphasis is placed on the recognition mechanisms as such, study abroad eventually might be recognized, even if the development and improvement of educational and administrative provisions is neglected and even if thus the quality of study abroad which is genuinely worth recognition is not achieved. This does not mean, however, that no effort is needed to arrange recognition procedures as such.

The range of educational and administrative provisions which has actually emerged in programmes of study abroad - ERASMUS-supported ICPs could be based in this respect on prior experiences - is very impressive. They may serve academic, cultural, social/personal, professional aims as well as that of the improvement of foreign language proficiency. They may address the problems and responses of the students prior to their decision and at the point of decision to participate, during a preparatory stage, at the time of departure and arrival, during the stay abroad, at the time of termination and upon return, during a reintegration stage or in the final period of study. The methods chosen include information, counselling and advice, courses and teaching, monitoring, assessment and certification.

We suggest that the *specific European approach to study abroad* already developed in the framework of Joint Study Programmes is characterized by three elements: *institutional roots at departmental level, strong emphasis on academic achievement and emphasis on the curriculum as a 'Gestalt' or as a 'menu' rather than a 'cafeteria'*. The strength of this model - the stimulation of curricular integration of study abroad and study at home - would probably be undermined,

if one of those elements was removed, for example if the ERASMUS programme predominantly promoted cooperation the central level of universities rather than at departmental level. The strong academic emphasis typical of this model, however, might not take sufficiently into account some important strengths of study abroad in their recognition procedures and decisions: their strength in supporting personal maturation, broadening students' capacity for reflection and socializing them to cope with hitherto unknown environments, people and tasks. A concept taking due account of those accomplishments would certainly be able to stand up to some loss of cognitive and fact-learning.

Some *caution seems* to be appropriate regarding debate on programmes of study abroad which suggests that recognition should be granted, if *educational and administrative provisions for study abroad are all-embracing and highly formalized, and if learning abroad is largely prescribed*. In fact, even most programmes comprising mandatory study periods abroad for their students and leading to a double-degree, i.e. degrees awarded by both the home and the host institution, have established fairly far-reaching provisions, a high degree of formalized cooperation and a largely prescribed academic programme to be taken abroad. Also, surveys on programmes of study abroad suggest that a high degree of formalization of the programmes and a high degree of prescription is more likely to lead to a high degree of recognition. There are obvious exceptions, though, indicating that alternative options might be successful as well: programmes allowing a wide range of options as well as programmes most concerned with increasing the opportunities of their students in gaining experiences sharply in contrast to those at home.

We have sought to describe only the procedures for granting recognition in order to provide information about the *range of options*. We have noted in several cases formal agreements on recognition between partner institutions, comprehensive assessment and certification at the end of the study abroad, automatic initiation of the recognition procedure by the home university, a broad range of procedures for assessment upon return, award of formal recognition, provisions for compensating failure abroad as well as reference to study abroad in final assessment and in examinations. The rationales of very elaborate recognition procedures vary: they may be driven by mistrust about achievement abroad, by efforts to minimize risks for mobile students or by the desire to demonstrate the strengths of learning abroad.

In summing up the various experiences, one can point out various possible improvements regarding recognition: some administrative barriers could be overcome, efforts to improve the range and quality of educational and administrative provisions of programmes of study abroad in general could be helpful, as well as appropriate arrangements for recognition procedures as such. In the framework of the academic traditions of the European university,

the underlying concept of curricular integration of the period of study abroad into the overall course programme at the home institution might be the most crucial and possibly the most convincing principle in ensuring recognition of the achievements and experiences acquired during a period of study at a partner university in another Member State of the European Community.

These views and suggestions reflect experience acquired prior to the establishment of the ERASMUS programme and some sketchy information on the first year of ERASMUS itself. Certainly, more thorough evaluation in the future might lead to more detailed knowledge and more soundly-based proposals. The information available, however, suffices to highlight some typical successes and problems of recognition relevant to the decisions which shape ERASMUS-supported arrangements for student mobility.

References

BARON, Britta and SMITH, Alan, eds. *Higher Education in the European Community: Study Abroad in the European Community*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 1987.

BURN, Barbara B., CERYCH, Ladislav and SMITH, Alan, eds. *Study Abroad Programmes*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers 1990.

Conference on Higher Education Cooperation in the European Community, Brussels, 27-29 November 1985: Conference Document. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities and Office for Cooperation in Education, 1985.

DALICHOW, Fritz and TEICHLER, Ulrich. *Higher Education in the European Community: Recognition of Study Abroad in the European Community*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 1986.

DALICHOW, Fritz, TEICHLER, Ulrich and SMITH, Alan. "Academic Recognition of Study Abroad and Joint Study Programmes", in *Conference on Higher Education Cooperation in the European Community, Brussels, 27-29 November 1985: Conference Document*. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities and Office for Cooperation in Education, 1985, pp. 114-120.

OPPER, Susan, TEICHLER, Ulrich and CARLSON, Jerry. *The Impact of Study Abroad Programmes on Students and Graduates*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers 1990.

SMITH, Alan. Joint Programmes of Study: *An Instrument of European Cooperation in Higher Education*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 1979.

SMITH, Alan. "Academic Recognition", in BARON, Britta and SMITH, Alan, eds. *Higher Education in the European Community: Study Abroad in the European Community*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 1987, pp. 158-201.

TEICHLER, Ulrich and OPPER, Susan. *Erträge des Auslandsstudiums für Studierende und Absolventen*. Bad Honnef: Bock, 1988 (Studien des Bundesministeriums für Bildung und Wissenschaft zu Bildung und Wissenschaft, Vol 68).

TEICHLER, Ulrich and SMITH, Alan. *Auslandsstudienprogramme und ihre Erträge für Studierende und Absolventen*. Bonn: Bundesminister für Bildung und Wissenschaft, 1988 (Bildung - Wissenschaft - aktuell, No. 8/88).

TEICHLER, Ulrich, SMITH, Alan and STEUBE, Wolfgang. *Auslandsstudienprogramme im Vergleich*. Bad Honnef: Bock, 1988 (Studien des Bundesministeriums für Bildung und Wissenschaft zu Bildung und Wissenschaft, Vol 69).

Anerkennung und Anrechnung des Auslandsstudiums in Europa - Erfahrungen und Probleme

(Kurzfassung des englischen Textes)

1. Zur Entstehung der Studie

Im Rahmen der zunehmenden Europäisierung vieler Bereiche und der verstärkten Förderung des Auslandsstudiums wird die Frage immer wichtiger, unter welchen Bedingungen und in welchem Maße die im Ausland erbrachten Studienleistungen als gleichwertig zum Studium im eigenen Land bzw. an der Heimathochschule anerkannt werden. Im Rahmen der Begleitforschung zum ERASMUS-Programm zur Förderung studentischer Mobilität in der Europäischen Gemeinschaft entstand eine Studie zur Lage und zu den Problemen der Anerkennung von Auslandsstudien; deren Befunde sind im folgenden kurz zusammengefaßt.

Ausgewertet wurden dabei in erster Linie Ergebnisse von Forschungsarbeiten über Auslandsstudienprogramme, die bereits vor der Etablierung des ERASMUS-Programms vorlagen; die Ergebnisse dieser Arbeiten, an denen der Autor beteiligt war, sind zum Teil in die Entscheidungen über die Gestaltung des ERASMUS-Programms eingeflossen. Berücksichtigt werden daneben ausgewählte Berichte und andere Dokumente, die von den Koordinatoren der seitens des ERASMUS-Programms 1987/88 geförderten Hochschulkooperationsprogramme zur Verfügung gestellt wurden. Diese offiziellen Berichte und Dokumente, die ein weites Spektrum von Themenschwerpunkten behandeln, gehen häufig auf Fragen der Anerkennung ein, denn ein gewisses Mindestmaß an Anerkennung der im Ausland erbrachten Studienleistungen ist eine zentrale Förderungsvoraussetzung im Rahmen des ERASMUS-Programms. Schließlich wurden Tagungen von Koordinatoren der Hochschulkooperationsprogramme und von Studierenden, die ein ERASMUS-Stipendium erhalten hatten, ausgewertet.

2. Verschiedene Bedeutungen von "Anerkennung"

Beschäftigt man sich mit der Anerkennungsproblematik im Rahmen des Studentenaustausches zwischen Staaten der Europäischen Gemeinschaft, so stellt man eine recht unterschiedliche Verwendung des Begriffes "Anerkennung" fest. Es lassen sich vier weitverbreitete Bedeutungen beobachten:

- "Anerkennung", verstanden als die prinzipielle Bereitschaft, das im Ausland erbrachte Studium im eigenen Land als gleichwertig zu akzeptieren bzw. anzuerkennen - dafür ist die Bezeichnung "Anerkennung" zweifellos angemessen;
- "Anerkennung", verstanden als die Regelungen und Mechanismen, in deren Rahmen die im Ausland gezeigten Leistungen als gleichwertig zu Studienleistungen im Herkunftsland eingestuft werden; hier wäre es zutreffender, von "Anrechnung" zu sprechen;
- "Anerkennung" als Anerkennung von Studiengängen, die eine Auslandsstudienkompontente beinhalten; im deutschen Kontext wäre es angemessener, hier von "Genehmigung" von Studienordnungen mit Auslandsstudienanteilen zu sprechen;
- "Anerkennung" als Zertifizierung, angefangen von einer schriftlichen Bestätigung der Auslandsstudienphase im Rahmen des Diplomzeugnisses oder als ergänzende Bescheinigung bis hin zu einer sogenannten Doppeldiplomierung, d.h. der Verleihung eines Hochschulgrades sowohl durch die Gasthochschule als auch durch die Herkunftshochschule; in diesem Falle wäre es besser, von "Zertifizierung" des Auslandsstudiums zu sprechen.

Unseres Erachtens sollte der Begriff "Anerkennung" also nur in der ersten Bedeutung verwendet werden. Daneben ist die Unterscheidung zwischen "Anerkennung" und "Anrechnung" hilfreich. Auf Fragen der "Genehmigung" und der "Zertifizierung" wird im Rahmen dieser Studie nur am Rande eingegangen.

3. Zwecksetzungen von "Anerkennung" und "Anrechnung" im Kontext von Auslandsstudienprogrammen

Anerkennung und Anrechung im Rahmen von Auslandsstudienprogrammen kann man nach ihrer Zwecksetzung in drei Typen klassifizieren:

- Anerkennung und Anrechnung des Studiums, das der Auslandsstudienphase vorangeht (sie erfolgen durch die ausländische Partnerhochschule); dies bereitet im Einzelfalle die geringsten Probleme, wenn sich zwei oder mehr Hochschulen über ein Austauschprogramm geeinigt haben, da ja die Verantwortung für den Studienerfolg insgesamt bei der Herkunftshochschule liegt.
- Anerkennung und Anrechnung der Studienleistungen der Auslandsstudienphase an sich (seitens der Herkunftshochschule); dies ist der Kern der "Anerkennungs"- und "Anrechnungs"-Problematik bei einem zeitweiligen Studium im Ausland und steht im Mittelpunkt der folgenden Überlegungen.

- Anerkennung und Anrechnung der Studienleistungen seitens der ausländischen Partnerhochschule in dem Falle, daß diese den Studienabschluß verleiht; hier geht es um die Sonderfälle, daß die gastgebende Hochschule schließlich den Studienabschluß verleiht - sei es, daß das Auslandsstudienprogramm eine Doppel-Diplomierung oder einen Wechsel zwischen der Hochschule des Studienbeginns und des Studienabschlusses in der Regel vorsieht, oder sei es, daß einzelne Studierende während des Auslandsstudiums zu dem Entschluß kommen, nicht mehr an die Herkunftshochschule zurückkehren, sondern an der Gasthochschule bleiben zu wollen.

4. Die Bedeutung der Anerkennung

Aus vier Gründen kann man feststellen, daß Anerkennung und Anrechnung eine sehr wichtige Rolle für die Erweiterung von Auslandsstudienangeboten und für die Teilnahme von Studierenden an Auslandsstudienprogrammen spielen. Eine weitestgehende Anerkennung von im Ausland erbrachten Studienleistungen reduziert erstens für die Studierenden die mit dem Auslandsstudium verbundenen Risiken bzw. "Unkosten". Zweitens ist die "Gefahr" einer Verlängerung der Studienzeit geringer. Drittens führen Bemühungen, die Anerkennung des Auslandsstudiums zu sichern, in der Regel dazu, die Qualität der Auslandsstudienangebote zu verbessern. Viertens werden Studienphasen und Studiengänge, die genuin international oder spezifisch auf Europa bezogen sind ('Europa-Studien', Internationales Recht o.ä.), dadurch besser abgesichert.

5. Hindernisse gegenüber einer Anerkennung des Auslandsstudiums

In der Realität existieren jedoch etliche Hindernisse gegenüber einer völligen Anrechnung von Auslandsstudienphasen. Sechs Arten von Gründen für eine Einschränkung der Anerkennung und Anrechnung lassen sich vor allem aufzeigen:

- Probleme, die Studierende mit dem Leben und Lernen im Ausland haben (Studium in einer Fremdsprache, Zeitaufwand für Umzug, Integrationsprobleme im Ausland usw.);
- Unterschiede zwischen der Herkunfts- und Gasthochschule hinsichtlich der Lehr- und Lernmethoden und der Beurteilungspraxis;
- Diskrepanzen in der Dauer bzw. in der konkreten Zeitspanne zwischen der Auslandsstudienphase einerseits und den an der Gasthochschule üblichen Lern- und Prüfungsphasen andererseits;

- inhaltliche Diskrepanzen zwischen den Studienschwerpunkten während der Auslands-studienphase und den Studienschwerpunkten, die von den Studierenden in einem Studium an ihrer Herkunftshochschule verlangt worden wären;
- Qualitätsunterschiede in den Studienangeboten der Herkunfts- und Gasthochschule und
- nicht zuletzt auch administrative und organisatorische Probleme (zum Beispiel Zulassungsbeschränkungen zu bestimmten Lehrveranstaltungen an der Gasthochschule).

6. Zum Ausmaß der Anrechnung

Zur Analyse, in welchem Umfang die Austauschprogramme, die eine ERASMUS-Förderung erhalten, die genannten Hindernisse bewältigen, d.h. inwieweit den Studierenden, die Empfänger eines ERASMUS-Stipendiums sind, tatsächlich eine Anerkennung ihres Auslandsstudiums in einem anderen Mitgliedsstaat der Europäischen Gemeinschaft nach der Rückkehr gewährt wird, erlauben die bisher verfügbaren Daten noch keine validen Aussagen, weil das ERASMUS-Programm noch zu neu und erste Evaluationsstudien dazu jetzt erst durchgeführt werden; dies wird erst in den nächsten Jahren möglich sein. Drei in den Jahren 1986 und 1988 veröffentlichte Studien deuten darauf hin, daß zwischen 60 und 75 Prozent der dort untersuchten Auslandsstudienprogramme die Studienleistungen im Ausland voll anrechnen; gewisse Vorbehalte gegenüber diesen Befunden sind jedoch angebracht, da die befragten Studierenden den Umfang der Anrechnung ihrer Studienleistungen deutlich eingeschränkter wahrnahmen als die Leiter der untersuchten Programme. Darüber hinaus muß man bedenken, daß viele der von ERASMUS geförderten Hochschulkooperationsprogramme neueren Datums sind und sie daher vermutlich in vielen Fällen bei der Bewältigung einiger Anerkennungsprobleme noch in den Kinderschuhen stecken, während die in den Studien von 1986 und 1988 untersuchten Programme schon auf mehrjährige Erfahrung zurückblicken konnten.

Aussagen über den Anteil an Auslandsstudienprogrammen, bei denen eine volle Anrechnung nach der Rückkehr erfolgt, müssen auf jeden Fall mit großer Vorsicht betrachtet werden, denn 'volle Anerkennung' oder 'volle Anrechnung' kann auf verschiedene Weise definiert werden:

(a) Gemeint sein kann, daß sämtliche erfolgreiche Arbeit im Ausland später angerechnet wird.

(b) Möglich ist auch, daß sich die Definition auf eine Anrechnung in dem Um-fang von Studienleistungen bezieht, der von den Studierenden in

einer entsprechenden Zeitperiode an der Herkunftshochschule gewöhnlich erwartet wird (gleichgültig, ob alle diese Leistungen durch 'Scheine', 'credits' oder ähnlich zertifiziert werden oder nicht).

(c) Schließlich kann als Kriterium für 'volle' Anrechnung gesetzt werden, daß die Studienphase im Ausland zu keiner Verlängerung der Gesamtstudiendauer führt.

In vielen empirischen Untersuchungen zum Auslandsstudium wurden unterschiedliche Vorstellungen darüber, was 'volle' Anrechnung bedeuten kann, nicht beachtet. In einer Mitte der achtziger Jahre durchgeführten Studie zu Auslandsstudienprogrammen in Großbritannien, Frankreich, Schweden, den USA und der Bundesrepublik Deutschland zum Beispiel gaben 38 Prozent der Studierenden an, daß sie keine volle Anrechnung bekamen, und 45 Prozent erwarteten eine Verlängerung der gesamten Studiendauer infolge des Auslandsstudiums.

7. Strategien der Hochschulen angesichts der Anerkennungsprobleme

Angesichts der aufgezeigten Probleme kann es nicht überraschen, daß bei einer Reihe von Programmen Strategien eingeschlagen werden, entweder eine volle Anrechnung durch besondere Hürden oder Umwege zu erreichen oder gar nicht anzustreben. Mindestens sieben verschiedene Strategien solcher Art lassen sich identifizieren:

- die Eliten-Strategie (sehr leistungsstarke Studierende mit großer Kompetenz in der Sprache des Gastlandes und hoher Anpassungsfähigkeit an neue Situationen werden ausgewählt, in der Überzeugung, daß ihre Qualität schon jede Schwäche und jedes Problem des Studiums in einem anderen Lande ausgleichen wird);
- die Belastungs-Strategie (von den Studierenden wird erwartet, daß sie, wenn sie ins Ausland gehen, eine höhere Arbeitsbelastung - zur Vorbereitung oder während des Auslandsstudienaufenthalts - auf sich nehmen, als sie dies an ihrer Herkunftshochschule gewöhnlich tun würden);
- die Additions-Strategie (von den Studierenden wird erwartet, daß sie mehr und länger studieren - in bezug auf die Gesamtstudiendauer -, dafür aber auch eine zusätzliche Qualifikation oder eine sich von der 'normaler' Studierender unterscheidende Qualifikation erreichen; zum Beispiel: ein regulärer Studiengang in Betriebswirtschaft an der Universität X dauert 3 Jahre, ein Studiengang an derselben Universität, der ein Auslandsjahr einschließt, dauert 4 Jahre und führt zu einer vom dreijährigen Studiengang verschiedenen Qualifikation, die sich 'European Business' nennt);

- Die Aufhebung von Wahlmöglichkeiten-Strategie (von den Studierenden wird erwartet, daß sie alle Pflichtkurse in den Studienjahren an der Herkunftshochschule nehmen und alle ihre Wahlfächer und offenen Studienzeiten auf die Auslandsstudienphase konzentrieren; Anrechnung erfolgt in dem Sinne, daß das Auslandsstudium die freiwilligen Studienkomponenten an der Herkunftshochschule ersetzt);
- die Homogenisierungs-Strategie (Veranstaltungen im Ausland sind so zu belegen oder werden in Absprache mit der Gasthochschule so gestaltet, daß sie so identisch wie möglich zu den Veranstaltungen an der Herkunftshochschule sind);
- die stillschweigende Duldungs-Strategie (es wird hingenommen, daß die belegten Veranstaltungen im Ausland nicht auf demselben Niveau sind oder nicht den gleichen Umfang haben wie die an der Herkunftshochschule; dies wird stillschweigend in der Überzeugung geduldet, daß die Studierenden dafür andere, schlecht zu bewertende aber genauso wichtige Erfahrungen und Qualifikationen während ihres Auslandsaufenthalts erlangen);
- die Teil-Anerkennungs-Strategie (die Studienleistung im Ausland wird in der Regel nur teilweise anerkannt).

Angesichts der Vielfalt der praktizierten Anrechnungs- und Anerkennungsstrategien dieser Art empfiehlt die Studie, daß die Kommission der Europäischen Gemeinschaften weiterhin die volle Anrechnung des Studiums an der Gasthochschule auf das Studium an der Herkunftshochschule als Ziel fordern, aber flexibel in der Interpretation von Anrechnung je nach den Gegebenheiten sein sollte. Denn eine zu starke Betonung der 'vollen' Anrechnung und eine entsprechende Überprüfung könnten zu einem bürokratischen Zirkel führen, wobei nicht wenige Programme aus opportunistischen Gründen - um sich der ERASMUS-Unterstützung zu versichern - volle Anerkennung gewähren, selbst wenn Zweifel an der Äquivalenz des Auslandsstudiums zum Studium an der Herkunftshochschule bestehen. Auch könnten unter solchen Bedingungen rigide Strategien zur Gestaltung des Auslandsstudienaufenthalts gewährt werden, um eine Anerkennung sicherzustellen, wodurch manche Potentiale des Auslandsstudiums verschlossen würden - z.B. die Suche nach Kontrasterlebnissen zum Studium oder zu den gesellschaftlichen Bedingungen im Herkunftsland oder die Motivierung solcher Studierender zu einer Studienphase im Ausland, denen eine solche Option schwerfällt.

8. Häufigkeit der Anerkennungsprobleme im ERASMUS-Programm

In etwas über 20 Prozent der Erfahrungsberichte, die die Koordinatoren der ERASMUS-Hochschulkooperationsprogramme 1987/88 vorlegten, werden entweder Anerkennungsprobleme explizit genannt, oder es wird auf Probleme hingewiesen, die die Anerkennung möglicherweise erschweren. Dabei werden vor allem Disparitäten inhaltlicher und struktureller Art zwischen Herkunfts- und Gasthochschule genannt wie auch unterschiedliche Beurteilungs- und Prüfungsmodalitäten, Abstimmungsprobleme mit hochschulexternen Instanzen, die auf Studienordnungen Einfluß nehmen, Diskrepanzen zwischen der Gast- und Herkunftshochschule in Dauer und Zeitpunkt des Beginns von Studienphasen (z.B. Semester, Prüfungszeitpunkten) und schließlich individuelles Scheitern von Studierenden an den geforderten Standards. Einige der von den Programmkoordinatoren genannten Probleme beziehen sich stärker auf allgemeine Charakteristika des Bildungssystems des jeweiligen Gastlandes als auf Besonderheiten der einzelnen teilnehmenden Hochschulen. Probleme der Anerkennung waren dabei häufiger anzutreffen, wenn die Studiengänge an der Herkunftshochschule einen hohen Anteil von Pflichtkursen und eine große Anzahl von Zwischenprüfungen vorsahen. Allerdings ist einschränkend zu bedenken, daß die genannten Aussagen der Programmkoordinatoren oft zu offen waren, um hier eindeutige Schlüsse ziehen zu können.

9. Zusammenhänge zwischen Programmorganisation und Anrechnung des Auslandsstudiums

Das ERASMUS-Programm fördert im wesentlichen Studenten-Mobilitätsprogramme 'organisierter' Art; Umfang und Art der Organisiertheit eines Programms können große Auswirkungen auf die Anrechnungsmodalitäten und den Grad der Anerkennung haben. In der Studie werden organisatorische Maßnahmen und strukturelle Merkmale der Programme (z.B. Information, Vorbereitung, Beratung, Zertifizierung und Zeitpunkt des Auslandsstudienaufenthalts) typologisiert, die an dieser Stelle nicht im einzelnen erläutert werden sollen. Die Analyse der organisatorischen Merkmale der Programme läßt zwei eindeutige Schlüsse zu:

- Wenn die organisatorische Verantwortung für die Programme von der Fakultäts- oder Fachbereichsebene auf die zentrale Ebene der Hochschulleitung und -verwaltung verlagert würde, würden sich zweifellos die Bemühungen zur Studiengangsentwicklung verringern; damit würde das ERASMUS-Programm auch weniger als bisher zur Entwicklung neuer europäischer und internationaler Qualifikationsprofile beitragen.

- Bei der Entwicklung von Kooperationsprogrammen und den damit verbundenen Entscheidungen über den Studiengang und über Fragen der Anerkennung und Anrechnung wird deutlich, daß gerade beim Studium in einem anderen Land zusätzlich zu den wissenschaftlichen Aspekten andere Aspekte eine wichtige Bedeutung haben, so insbesondere das Lernen einer Fremdsprache sowie kulturelles und soziales Lernen. Die Anrechnung kann in einem größeren Umfang oder vollständig gewährt werden, wenn Aspekte wie Reifungsprozesse, die Erweiterung der Reflexionsfähigkeit, die Bewältigung von neuen und unbekannten Situationen und Aufgaben u.ä. als wertvolle Erträge des Studiums bewertet werden, die in einem gewissen Umfang andere wissenschaftliche Erträge des Studiums ausgleichen könnten. Dies hat möglicherweise auch Rückwirkungen auf vorherrschende Vorstellungen über die Aufgaben des Studiums generell - also nicht nur auf die Aufgaben des Studiums, zu dem eine Auslandsstudienphase gehört.

10. Zusammenhänge zwischen der inhaltlichen Gestaltung der Auslandsstudienphase und der Anrechnung ihrer Ergebnisse

Die Anrechnung des Studiums in einem anderen Land nach der Rückkehr ist zweifellos davon beeinflußt, wie diese Phase curricular in den Studiengang an der Herkunftshochschule eingebettet ist. Frühere Forschungsarbeiten weisen darauf hin, daß ein hoher Grad der Anerkennung am wahrscheinlichsten ist, wenn der wissenschaftliche Ertrag des Auslandsstudiums ein stark betontes Ziel des Programms ist, wenn die Veranstaltungen, die im Ausland belegt werden, weitgehend vorgeschrieben sind, wenn die Auslandsstudienphase obligatorischer Bestandteil des Studiengangs an der Herkunftshochschule ist und wenn Herkunfts- und Gasthochschule in curricularen und anderen Aspekten des Programms eng kooperieren. Man kann die Bedeutung der curricularen Einbettung der Auslandsstudienphase auf fünf Dimensionen skizzieren:

- Grad der curricularen Integration,
- spezielle Zertifizierung des Auslandsstudiums (in manchen Fällen eine doppelte Diplomierung),
- Auslandsstudium als freiwilliger bzw. obligatorischer Bestandteil des Studienganges,
- Ausmaß der Verschiedenheit bzw. Ähnlichkeit der Inhalte und Strukturen der Studienangebote an der Herkunfts- und Gasthochschule,
- Ausmaß der Pflichtveranstaltungen, die in der Auslandsstudienphase belegt werden müssen.

11. Leistungsbewertung in der Auslandsstudienphase und Modalitäten der Anrechnung des Auslandsstudiums

Wie bereits angedeutet, gibt es ein großes Spektrum von Arrangements und Prozeduren für die Anerkennung und Anrechnung von Studienphasen im Ausland. Als wichtigste sind zu nennen:

- Verträge und andere formelle Vereinbarungen zu Anerkennungsfragen zwischen der Herkunfts- und der Gasthochschule bzw. zwischen Einheiten der kooperierenden Hochschulen;
- umfassende Beurteilung der Studienleistungen während der Auslandsstudienphase durch die Gasthochschule (etwa Abschlußprüfung am Schluß der Auslandsstudienphase);
- zusammenfassende Zertifizierung der Veranstaltungen und Prüfungen im Ausland (Abschlußbescheinigung der Gasthochschule, in der die einzelnen Aktivitäten und Leistungsnachweise bestätigt werden);
- Entwicklung eines Anerkennungsverfahrens an der Herkunftshochschule für die zurückkehrenden Studierenden (automatisch oder auf Wunsch eingeleitet);
- Etablierung eines Verfahrens zur Beurteilung der Studienleistungen im Ausland durch die Herkunftshochschule (etwa Festsetzung und Prüfung von Listen anerkennbarer Lehrveranstaltungen, Umrechnung von Noten usw.);
- Angebote zur Wiederholung von Veranstaltungen und Prüfungen, an denen im Ausland ohne Erfolg teilgenommen wurde;
- Verfahren zur expliziten Erklärung der Äquivalenz von Studienleistungen bzw. Studienphasen im Ausland;
- Explizite Bezugnahme auf das Auslandsstudium in den Examensurkunden.

Nach den Erfahrungen früherer Forschungsarbeiten erscheint die Förderungspolitik des ERASMUS-Programms sinnvoll, den gut organisierten und integrierten Programmen, die eine angemessene Anerkennung als Regel vorsehen, eine gewisse Priorität einzuräumen, daneben aber Spielraum für die Förderung eines breiten Spektrums von Programmen zu erhalten, die weniger strukturiert sind und bei denen ein hoher Grad der Anrechnung nicht in gleichem Maße gesichert ist.

12. Einige Konsequenzen

Einige praktische Konsequenzen sowohl für die Beurteilung eigener Auslandsstudienprogramme als auch für die Evaluation im Rahmen der Förderung von Auslandsstudienprogrammen lassen sich aufgrund der vorangehenden Befunde und Überlegungen hervorheben:

(a) Für die Beurteilung, in welchem Maße eine Anrechnung der Studienphase im Ausland erfolgt, haben drei Maßstäbe ihre jeweils spezifische Bedeutung: der Grad der Anrechnung der in der Auslandsstudienphase absolvierten Kurse und Leistungsnachweise; die Relation zwischen angerechneten Ergebnissen des Auslandsstudiums zu den üblicherweise an der Heimathochschule erwarteten Studienergebnissen für eine entsprechende Zeitphase des Studiums; mögliche Verlängerungen der gesamten Studiendauer infolge des Auslandsstudiums.

(b) Für die Etablierung von Auslandsstudienprogrammen sollte zwar die Frage der Anrechnung nach der Rückkehr eine zentrale Bedeutung haben, aber Entscheidungen über das Auslandsstudium sollten auch nicht von vornherein zu eng auf Fragen der Anerkennung ausgerichtet sein. Denn unter Umständen ändern sich gerade aufgrund der Erfahrungen, die mit dem Auslandsstudium im Laufe der Zeit gewonnen werden, die Vorstellungen darüber, was anerkennenswert ist.

(c) Schließlich ist eine gewisse Vorsicht gegenüber allzu strukturierten Rezepten angebracht, wie die 'richtigen' Anerkennungs- und Anrechnungsprozeduren auszusehen haben. Wenn auch ein hoher Grad an Formalisierung und Integration der Auslandsstudienprogramme in vielen Fällen zu relativ hoher Anrechnung führt, gibt es doch auch eine ganze Reihe von Programmen mit sehr 'lockerer' Struktur, bei denen eine volle Anrechnung üblich ist. Außerdem würden durch zu unflexible und vereinheitlichte Anerkennungs- und Anrechnungsrezepte Besonderheiten der einzelnen Länder und auch Hochschulen im Hinblick auf Formen des Lehrens und Prüfens nicht berücksichtigt und somit auf die Dauer eine starke Vereinheitlichung der europäischen Hochschulsysteme erforderlich - eine Konsequenz, die gerade dem Ziel entgegensteht, durch Mobilität in Europa eine Vielfalt der Hochschulen kennenzulernen.

ERASMUS Monographs

1. Student Mobility within ERASMUS 1987/88
U. Teichler, F. Maiworm, W. Steube
Wissenschaftliches Zentrum für Berufs- und Hochschulforschung, Kassel, 1990.

Contact: Prof. Ulrich Teichler
Wissenschaftliches Zentrum für Berufs- und Hochschulforschung,
Gesamthochschule Kassel
Henschelstraße 4
D-3500 Kassel
Federal Republic of Germany

Tel.: 49-561-804 2415 / Fax: 49-561-804 3301

2. L'amélioration de la préparation linguistique et socioculturelle des étudiants ERASMUS
G. Baumgratz-Gangl, N. Deyson, G. Kloss
Unité langues pour la Coopération en Europe (ULCE), July 1989.

Contact: Dr. Gisela Baumgratz-Gangl
Unité langues pour la Coopération en Europe (ULCE)
Institut européen d'éducation et de politique sociale
c/o Université de Paris IX-Dauphine
Place du Maréchal de Lattre de Tassigny
F-75116 Paris
France

Tel.: 33-1-47.27.06.41 / 45.05.14.10, poste 3000
Fax: 33-1-45.53.81.34

3. Recognition - A Typological Overview of Recognition Issues Arising in Temporary Study Abroad
U. Teichler
Wissenschaftliches Zentrum für Berufs- und Hochschulforschung, Kassel, 1990.

Contact: Prof. Ulrich Teichler
Wissenschaftliches Zentrum für Berufs- und Hochschulforschung,
Gesamthochschule Kassel
Henschelstraße 4
D-3500 Kassel
Federal Republic of Germany

Tel.: 49-561-804 2415 / Fax: 49-561-804 3301

4. Untersuchung über die Beteiligung der Medizin im ERASMUS-Programm (Study on the Participation of Medicine in ERASMUS)
In German with an English summary
K. Schnitzer, E. Korte
HIS Hochschul-Informations-System GmbH
in: HIS Hochschulplanung 85, Hannover 1990.

Contact: Dr. Klaus Schnitzer
HIS Hochschul-Informations-System
Postfach 2920
D-3000 Hannover
Federal Republic of Germany

Tel.: 49-511-1220297 / Fax: 49-511-1220250

5. Teacher Education and the ERASMUS Programme
M. Bruce
ATEE (Association for Teacher Education in Europe)
in: European Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 12, No. 3, 1989 (pp. 197 - 228)
ISSN 0261-9768 - Brussels 1989.

Contact: A.T.E.E. - Association for Teacher Education in Europe
Rue de la Concorde 51
B-1050 Bruxelles
Belgium

Tel.: 32-2-512 1734 / Fax: 32-2-512 3265

6. Les obstacles à la participation au programme ERASMUS dans le domaine de l'art et du design
P. Kuentz
Strasbourg, July 1989.

Contact: Prof. Pierre Kuentz
Ecole des Arts Decoratifs
1 rue de l'Académie
F-6700 Strasbourg
France

Tel.: 33-88-353858

7. ERASMUS et les arts du spectacle (musique, théâtre, danse)
D. Barriolade
EUROCREATION, Paris, July 1989.

Contact: Directeur de Projets Denise Barriolade
EUROCREATION
L'agence française des jeunes créateurs européens
3, rue Debelleyme
F-75003 Paris
France

Tel.: 33-1-48047879 / Fax: 33-1-40299246

8. Comparative Evaluation of ERASMUS ICPs in the Subject Areas of Business Management, Chemistry, History
Prof. A. Monasta
Università di Firenze, July 1989.

Contact: Prof. Attilio Monasta
Università degli Studi di Firenze
Facoltà di Magistero
Dipartemento di Scienze dell' Educazione
Via Cavour, 82
I-50129 Firenze
Italy

Tel.: 39-55-2757751/2757761

9. Survey of Academic Recognition within the Framework of ICPs in the Field of Mechanical Engineering
H. Risvig Henriksen
SEFI (Société Européenne pour la Formation des Ingénieurs),
Bruxelles, August 1989.

Contact: S.E.F.I. - Société Européenne pour la Formation des Ingénieurs
Rue de la Concorde 51
B-1050 Bruxelles
Belgium

Tel.: 32-2-512 1734 / Fax: 32-2-512 3265

10. ERASMUS PROGRAMME - Report on the Experience Acquired in the Application of the ERASMUS Programme 1987-1989
Commission of the European Communities, SEC(89) 2051
Brussels, 13 December 1989.

Contact: ERASMUS Bureau
15 rue d'Arlon
B-1040 Bruxelles
Belgium

Tel.: 32-2-233 0111 / Fax: 32-2-233 0150

11. La coopération inter-universitaire dans les sciences agronomiques, ERASMUS 1987/88 - 1990/91
Philippe Ruffio
ENSAR, Département des Sciences économiques et sociales, June 1990

Contact: M. Philippe Ruffio
l'Ecole Nationale Supérieure Agronomique de Rennes
65 rue de St Brieuc
F-35042 Rennes Cedex
FRANCE

Tel.: 33-99-590240

12. Student Mobility 1988/89 - Statistical Overview
U. Teichler, R. Kreitz, F. Maiworm
Wissenschaftliches Zentrum für Berufs- und Hochschulforschung, Kassel, 1990.

Contact: Prof. Ulrich Teichler
Wissenschaftliches Zentrum für Berufs- und Hochschulforschung,
Gesamthochschule Kassel
Henschelstraße 4
D-3500 Kassel
Federal Republic of Germany

Tel.: 49-561-804 2415 / Fax: 49-561-804 3301

13. Experience of ERASMUS Students 1988/89
U. Teichler, F. Maiworm, W. Steube
Wissenschaftliches Zentrum für Berufs- und Hochschulforschung, Kassel, 1990.

Contact: Prof. Ulrich Teichler
Wissenschaftliches Zentrum für Berufs- und Hochschulforschung,
Gesamthochschule Kassel
Henschelstraße 4
D-3500 Kassel
Federal Republic of Germany

Tel.: 49-561-804 2415 / Fax: 49-561-804 3301

14. Accomodation of ERASMUS Students in the Member States of the European Community
E. Berning, M. Weihrich-Dunkel, W. Fischer
Bayerisches Staatsinstitut für Hochschulforschung und Hochschulplanung,
München, July 1990

Contact : Professor E. Berning
Bayerisches Staatsinstitut für Hochschulforschung und Hochschulplanung
Arabellastraße 1
D-8000 München 81
Federal Republic of Germany

Tel.: 49-89-9214 2188 / Fax: 49-89-9214 3175

15. Working in the EC
Tony Raban
Cambridge, 1989

Contact: Project Director Tony Raban
Cambridge University Careers Service

Tel.: 44-223-338282 / Fax: 44-223-338281

The recognition of accomplishments achieved during a temporary study abroad period upon return by the home institution of higher education is generally viewed as one of the major criteria for the success of study abroad programmes, notably the ERASMUS programme of the European Community. This study aims to systematize concepts and modes of recognition. It also summarizes research findings about the extent of recognition granted and the variety and seriousness of obstacles to recognition. Finally, the implications of various forms of recognition are discussed.

Anerkennung des Auslandsstudiums – verstanden als Anrechnung von Studienleistungen, die während eines zeitweiligen Studiums im Ausland erbracht wurden, durch die Herkunftshochschule – gilt als eines der wichtigsten Erfolgkriterien für Auslandsstudienprogramme, so insbesondere für das ERASMUS-Programm der Europäischen Gemeinschaft. Diese Studie beabsichtigt, eine systematische Übersicht über Konzeptionen und Formen der Anerkennung und Anrechnung zu erstellen. Ferner werden vorliegende Forschungsergebnisse zum Ausmaß der Anrechnung und zu Barrieren gegenüber einer vollen Anrechnung zusammengetragen. Abschließend werden die Implikationen verschiedener Anerkennungsstrategien diskutiert.

ISBN 3-88122-618-4

67